

P1
A5

P1
A5

S

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

V.
VOLUME XLIV

BALTIMORE: THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING LEIPSIC: F. A. BROCKHAUS

1924

162863

P1
• A5
v. 11

162863

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLV.

No. 177.

	PAGE
I.—The Meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga. By FRANKLIN EDGERTON,	1
II.—Philological Studies. By PAUL HAUPT,	47
III.—Aeneas' City at the Mouth of the Tiber. By TENNEY FRANK,	64
IV.—The Letters on the Blocks of the Servian Wall. By TENNEY FRANK,	68
V.—The Metrical Arrangement of the <i>Kouμbs</i> in the <i>Agamemnon</i> of Aeschylus. By FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON,	70
VI.—A Suggested Emendation for Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i> , Line 1459. By FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON,	72
VII.—Notes on the <i>Rāuhineyacaritra</i> . By HELEN JOHNSON,	73
VIII.—Bantu Notes. By EDWIN H. TUTTLE,	76
REPORTS:	78
Hermes, LVII (1922), parts 3 and 4 (HERMAN L. EBELING).—Romania, Vol. XLVIII, Nos. 3 and 4 (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).	
REVIEWS:	85
Walter W. Hyde's <i>Olympic Victor Monuments</i> (T. LESLIE SHEAR).— <i>E. A. Lowe</i> and <i>E. K. Rand's</i> <i>Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger</i> (CHARLES U. CLARK).— <i>G. Janell's</i> <i>P. Vergili Maronis Opera</i> (TENNEY FRANK).— <i>N. W. DeWitt's</i> <i>Virgil's Biographia Litteraria</i> (WILFRED P. MUSTARD).— <i>Lynn Thorndyke's</i> <i>History of Magic and Experimental Science</i> (WILFRED P. MUSTARD).— <i>J. Vessereau's</i> <i>L'Etna Poème</i> (WILFRED P. MUSTARD).	
CORRESPONDENCE,	94
A. L. WHEELER.—GEORGE R. COFFMAN.	
BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE. By C. W. E. MILLER,	97
BOOKS RECEIVED,	101

No. 178.

I.—On the Armenian Version of Plato's Laws and Minos. By FRED. C. CONYBEARE,	105
II.—Notes on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3 B. C. By ALLEN B. WEST,	141
III.—Latin Quantitative Speech as Affected by Immigration. By TENNEY FRANK,	161
IV.—Aeneid IV, 551: <i>More Ferae</i> . By NORMAN W. DEWITT,	176
V.—Aeneid I, 599, <i>Exhaustis</i> or <i>Exhaustos</i> . By W. H. KIRK,	179
REPORTS:	182
<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i> , Vol. L. (W. P. MUSTARD).— <i>Revue de Philologie</i> , XLVI, 3-XLVII, 2 (C. V. B. WIGHT).	

REVIEWS,	189
<i>Julius Juethner's Hellenen und Barbaren</i> (WALTER W. HYDE). — <i>Hermann Dessau's Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit</i> (TENNEY FRANK).— <i>Koch-Helmreich-Kalbfleisch-Hartlich's Galeni De sanitate tuenda, etc.</i> (W. A. HEIDEL).— <i>Tupper-Ogle's Map's De Nugis Curialium; A. Bourger's and René Walz's Sénèque, Dialogues; A. F. Johnson's Petrarcae Epistolae Selectae</i> (W. P. MUSTARD).— <i>K. Būga's Lietuvių kalbos žodynas</i> (HAROLD H. BENDER).	

BOOKS RECEIVED,	199
-----------------	-----

No. 179.

	PAGE
I.—Vergil's Messianic Expectations. By W. A. HEIDEL,	205
II.—Philological and Archeological Studies. By PAUL HAUPT,	238
III.—On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the Aeneid. By M. B. OGLE,	260
IV.—Notes on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X. By GERTRUDE HIRST,	276
REPORTS:	284
Hermes, LVIII (1923), pp. 1-239 (HERMAN L. EBELING).— Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, LI (1923) (W. P. MUSTARD).	
REVIEWS:	291
<i>Louise E. W. Adams' A Study in the Commerce of Latium</i> (GORDON J. LAING).— <i>Lane Cooper's An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy</i> (CHARLES W. PEPPLER).— <i>W. M. Lindsay's Early Latin Verse</i> (GILBERT H. TAYLOR).	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	300

No. 180.

I.—Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i> . By R. B. STEELE,	301
II.—The Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost. By E. H. STURTEVANT,	329
III.—Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric.' By W. RHYS ROBERTS,	351
IV.—Ptolemy's <i>Skandia</i> . By KEMP MALONE,	362
V.—A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles. By L. A. POST,	371
VI.—The Indefinite First Singular. By H. C. NUTTING,	377
REPORTS:	380
Hermes, Vol. LVIII (1923), Nos. 3 and 4 (HERMAN L. EBELING).— <i>Romania</i> , Vol. XLIX (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).	
REVIEWS:	387
<i>Diels's T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura</i> (W. A. MERRILL).— <i>Von Duhn's Italische Gräberkunde</i> (LILY ROSS TAYLOR).— <i>Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius; Hosius' Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV; Sabbadini's Giovanni da Ravenna; Shipley's Velleius Paterculus</i> (W. P. MUSTARD).	
CORRESPONDENCE,	397
ERRATUM,	397
BOOKS RECEIVED,	398
INDEX,	401

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLV, 1

WHOLE No. 177

I.—THE MEANING OF SĀNKHYA AND YOGA.¹

loke 'smin dvividhā niṣṭhā purā proktā mayā 'nagha
jñānayogena sānkhyānām karmayogena yoginām.

"In this world a two-fold foundation (of religious salvation) has been expounded by Me of old: by the discipline of *knowledge* of the followers of Sāṅkhya, and by the discipline of *action* of the followers of Yoga."—Bhagavad Gītā 3. 3.

Philosophy in India has always been practical in its motive. And its practical motive has been what we should call religious. Namely, it professes to teach a method of salvation; to tell man how he can be saved. If it seeks the truth, it is not for the sake of the truth as an abstract end in itself; it is for the sake of the salvation which that truth is believed to bring with it. "The truth shall make you free"—literally "*free*" (*mukta*) from the evils of the "round of existences." This is the case even with the latest of Hindu philosophies; they all profess to be schemes of salvation. It is more emphatically, more pointedly true of

¹ In this article, "Hopkins" without further specification refers to the essay on "Epic Philosophy," pages 85-190 of *The Great Epic of India*, by E. Washburn Hopkins; New York, 1901. "Deussen" without further specification refers to the translation of *Vier Philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam*, by Paul Deussen ("in Gemeinschaft mit Dr. Otto Strauss"); Leipzig, 1906. It is a pleasure to express here my deep indebtedness to these two works, which have made my investigation immeasurably easier than it would have been without them. Considerations of space make it necessary for me to refer to them specifically, for the most part, only when I differ from them; I hope these references will not suggest a failure on my part to appreciate the profound and lasting value of both works. References are to the Calcutta edition of the Mahābhārata, which is abbreviated "C."; the Bombay edition is occasionally referred to as "B."

earlier Hindu speculations—because in their time there had not yet developed² sharp differences of opinion as to what absolute “truth” is, such as developed in later times.

In early times especially, then, the question uppermost in the minds of Hindu thinkers was not “What is truth?,” but “How can man be saved?” In so far as differences existed between different thinkers or schools, these concerned methods for reaching the goal. The goal with all alike was salvation. And salvation was at first conceived in much the same way with all. But there might be different roads to it.

In the Upaniṣads, at least the earliest dozen of them, we hear little even of such differences as to method. In them the prevailing point of view is that *knowledge* of the truth brings salvation immediately. “Knowing Brahman, to Brahman he goes.”³ He who knows the supreme truth, however it may be formulated, is thereby saved.⁴ This point of view remains perhaps the most fundamental method in later Hinduism. Other methods force an entry by claiming to be “just as good as” the way of knowledge, altho they sometimes end by playing the rôle of the camel and crowding the “way of knowledge” rather completely out of the tent. In the Bhagavad Gītā we are assured that “as a kindled fire burns firewood to ashes, so the fire of knowledge burns all deeds to ashes” (4. 37), that is, frees man from continued existence, the fruit of deeds; and again, “Even if thou shouldst be the worst of all sinners, merely by the boat of knowledge thou shalt cross over (the ‘sea’ of) all evil” (4. 36). What knowledge? The knowledge of the supreme religious truth, which each text professes to teach. Thus in the Gītā, with its ardent personal theism, it is often knowledge of God. Whosoever *knows* the mystic truth of God’s nature is freed from rebirth and goes to God (4. 9, 10; 7. 19; 10. 3; 14. 1 ff.). But elsewhere in the Gītā it is knowledge of the absolute separate-

² At least among those who passed as orthodox. For the present we may ignore the heretical or “materialistic” thinkers of whom we hear something in the epic and even earlier.

³ Kāuṣ. U. 1. 4; the same idea constantly recurs in the Upaniṣads.

⁴ The earlier history of this idea of the saving power of knowledge is discussed in my article on “The Philosophic Materials of the Atharva Veda,” *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920), pp. 117-135.

ness of the soul and body, the independence of the soul from the body and all acts and qualities (5. 16, 17, cf. the preceding verses; 14. 22-25). In fact, the Gītā, like other contemporary works and like the Upaniṣads, is apt to promise emancipation to any one who "knows" any particularly profound truth which it may from time to time set forth.

The Gītā, however, is more catholic than most of the early Upaniṣads, in that it admits the possibility of gaining salvation by more than one method. Indeed, in spite of the encomiums on knowledge quoted from it above, it tends to prefer certain other methods. We must remember that there is no reason for thinking of this as an inconsistency. It is perfectly rational to suppose that people may go by different roads, and still reach the same goal—salvation, that is, *nirvāṇa*, union with Brahman or God, or however it may be defined.⁵

One marked difference as to method concerns the question, how far is ordinary, worldly life consistent with the attainment of salvation? Since actions, according to the doctrine of karma, must have their "fruits" for the doer, and so imply continued empiric existence (which is the antithesis of salvation or release); therefore, as the Gītā says, "some wise men say that (all) action is to be abandoned as evil" (18. 3). To avoid the results of action, they propose simply not to act. This quietism, *sannyāsa*, *vāirāgya*, is definitely identified in the Gītā with the "way of knowledge," and the combination is called *Sāṅkhya*.⁶ The verse 3. 3, quoted at the beginning of this paper, plainly

⁵ In Upaniṣadic and epic philosophy, while there are different tentative formulations of the supreme truth, they are not clearly or consciously set off against each other; they are hardly recognized as mutually inconsistent. Such school differences as existed among orthodox thinkers (cf. note 2 above) were based on differences as to method, not as to facts (cf. Dahlmann, *Sāṅkhya-Philosophie*, pp. xv ff.), and there was no fixed relation between different definitions of salvation and different ways of reaching it. Cf. Mbh. 12. 11810, and my note 22, below.

⁶ Cf. Mbh. 12. 8804 ff., a treatise on the merits of the "way of knowledge" (*vidyā*), which in 8809 = *nivṛtti*, "abstention, inactivity," and which leads to the highest goal, in contrast with the "way of action" (*karman*, in 8809 = *pravṛtti*, "activity"), which leads to ever repeated rebirths. The name *Sāṅkhya* does not occur here, but the method described and recommended is precisely what the Gītā calls *Sāṅkhya*.

states that the "way (discipline) of knowledge" is the Sāṅkhyas' way; and in the next verse it is stated that abandonment, *sannyāsa*, of action (obviously the same as the Sāṅkhyas' "way of knowledge") is not, in the author's opinion, the best way of salvation; he prefers *karma-yoga*, the way of action. Again, in 5. 1, Arjuna asks which is better, abandonment of action (*sannyāsa karmanām*) or *yoga*? To which the reply is: "Both abandonment, *sannyāsa*, and discipline of action, *karma-yoga*, lead to salvation. But of these two discipline of action is better than abandonment of action" (5. 2). "Fools say that *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* are different, not the wise. He who applies himself to only one of these obtains the complete fruits of both (5. 4). The station that is won by the Sāṅkhyas is won also by the Yogas; he who regards Sāṅkhya and Yoga as one has true vision" (5. 5)—because they both lead to the same end, salvation. Nevertheless, the Gītā goes on: "But abandonment (*sannyāsa*) is hard to obtain without discipline (*yoga*). The sage who is disciplined in discipline (*yoga-yukta*) speedily goes to Brahman" (5. 6). It seems obvious from this—and there is no passage in the Gītā that is at all inconsistent with this interpretation—that Sāṅkhya in the Gītā means the way of salvation by pure knowledge, the intellectual method, and that it is understood as implying quietism, renunciation of action. Yoga, on the other hand, is understood as disciplined, unselfish activity, which according to the Gītā is just as good as inactivity, in that it produces none of the evil results which action otherwise produces (5. 3 says "whosoever neither hates nor loves is to be regarded as having permanently abandoned [action]"). This method is elsewhere in the Gītā developed at great length (see e. g. 2. 47; 3. 19). Acting without interest in the results of action has no binding effect, and is indeed preferable to inaction, which is an impossible dream (3. 5, 18. 11, 18. 60 etc.). This method of unselfish or disciplined activity, with indifference to results, is what the Gītā always means by Yoga when it contrasts it with Sāṅkhya, the (quietistic) way of knowledge. Yoga, "discipline," is synonymous with *karma-yoga*, "discipline of action."⁷ Both Sāṅkhya and Yoga are all right; both lead to

⁷ For a more exact definition of "Yoga" see the last part of this article.

salvation; but the intellectual and inactive way is hard; therefore the other is to be preferred.

Still other methods of salvation were known at the time, and are mentioned in the Gītā. In 6. 46 the *yogin*, the adherent of the way of Yoga or disciplined activity, is declared to be superior to the *jñānin*, adherent of the way of knowledge (the Sāṅkhya way just described), and also to the *tapasvin*, adherent of asceticism, penance, and the *karmin*, adherent of the ritualistic method, who depends on (religious, sacrificial) “works” (*karma* is here understood in that restricted sense, as Garbe rightly indicates in his translation). Penance, *tapas*, is more than mere quietism, *sannyāsa*. The comparatively low position assigned to it and to ritualism in this verse does not mean that the Gītā denies their validity, any more than it denies the validity of the “way of knowledge,” which is bracketed with them here, and which, as we have seen, is elsewhere definitely allowed as a way of salvation. Both penance and ritualism are referred to in complimentary ways in several passages in the Gītā, tho perhaps more frequent are comparatively uncomplimentary references. They are certainly not among the favorite methods of the Gītā. It is significant, however, that the way of devotion to God, *bhakti*, is not classed among the less desirable methods, either here or elsewhere in the Gītā. On the contrary, the very next verse (6. 47) exalts it as even higher than Yoga, or more precisely, as it is here put, as the highest and most perfect form of Yoga or disciplined activity: “Among all possessors of Yoga the most disciplined, *yuktatama*, is he that is devoted to Me.” As it is elsewhere put (18. 56 f., 9. 27), he who not only acts unselfishly, but does all acts as acts of service to God, gains salvation most easily of all (cf. 8. 14). The “easiest” way of salvation is naturally the best: why not? Tho there are various ways to the goal, and you can get there by any of them, it is surely only reasonable to prefer the easiest!

Nowhere in the Bhagavad Gītā is the word Sāṅkhya used in any other sense than this. *Nowhere is there a suggestion that it—or Yoga^{*} either—means any particular system of metaphysical truth.* In the Gītā Sāṅkhya and Yoga are not meta-

^{*} I shall speak below of the various ways in which the word Yoga is used.

physical, speculative systems, not what we should call philosophies at all, but ways of gaining salvation; *that and nothing else*.

Moreover, that and nothing else is what they are in all Indian literature until a late time,—until far down into the Christian era.

It seems to me that all previous studies in this field have suffered from the initial error of failing to inquire of the Hindu texts (of this period) themselves exactly what they mean by the words "Sāṅkhya" and "Yoga." The usual method is first to study the Sāṅkhya Kārikās (admittedly dating from not before the 5th century A. D., and admittedly the earliest "systematic" Sāṅkhya treatise); then to look in earlier texts for ideas resembling its ideas, and to call these ideas "early forms" (or "distortions") of the "Sāṅkhya system," taking for granted the *existence* of a "Sāṅkhya system" (in the sense of a speculative metaphysics) at this time.* The fact that the term Sāṅkhya is often associated in the early texts with ideas which are utterly at variance with those of the later Sāṅkhya system has not, to be sure, escaped the notice of previous writers. Of course not; for it is one of the most striking and self-evident of facts. Hopkins's intimate acquaintance with the philosophy of the Mahābhārata led him to the flat-footed conclusion that "Sāṅkhya is . . . an authority claimed for the most divergent teaching" (p. 138). Whether it follows from this that it is also "merely a name to appeal to, and stands in this regard on a footing with Veda" (*l. c.*), i. e. that it really means, or need mean, nothing at all when the Epic refers to "Sāṅkhya," is another question. I hope to show in this paper that a more likely inference from the state of the facts is that the term Sāṅkhya did not, in and of itself, imply *any* "teaching" at all in the sense of any speculative formulation of metaphysical truth, but merely the opinion that man could gain salvation by *knowing* the supreme truth, however formulated.

* Only Deussen (*Allgem. Gesch. d. Phil.*, I. 3, p. 15 ff.) says that Sāṅkhya and Yoga were "originally" not systems, but methods of salvation. This correct view is unfortunately vitiated, first, by the fact that Deussen fails to see clearly just what is meant by the two methods (he overlooks the two most significant passages in the Gītā, 3. 3 and 5. 1 ff.); and secondly by his erroneous concession (p. 18) that Sāṅkhya and Yoga developed into "systems" in the epic itself.

That Sāṅkhya is the “way of (salvation by) knowledge” is stated again and again with the utmost clearness, not only in the Bhagavad Gītā, but in other texts of the same period. This has been duly recorded by some scholars, notably by Hopkins (101 f.). I cannot but feel that the principal reason for the general failure to take this definition at its face value is the underlying assumption that somehow or other Sāṅkhya in early texts must mean something like the metaphysical system set forth in the late Sāṅkhya Kārikās. Now, I admit that it would be wrong-headed to neglect entirely the “Sāṅkhya system” of the Kārikās in a final evaluation of what “Sāṅkhya” means in earlier times. Before I finish, I shall take up this question (pages 32 ff. below) and set forth my views as to the relation between the early “Sāṅkhya” and the Kārikā “Sāṅkhya.” But for the present it seems to me methodologically more sound to close our eyes to that later Sāṅkhya of the Kārikās, and to see if we cannot get a clear and consistent definition of the term Sāṅkhya as used in the earliest texts where it occurs at all, namely, in the Mahābhārata and the later Upaniṣads. These will be admitted by all to be earlier, by a number of centuries, than the Kārikās. I hasten to grant that this does not *prove* that their use of the term “Sāṅkhya” is more original. All I assume for the present is that they represent a fairly circumscribed period in Hindu literature, which deserves—not, to be sure, to be treated as a definite unit, but—to be separated from the Kārikās and considered, in the first instance, absolutely independently of them, and as *comparatively speaking* a unit in distinction from them.

Early Sāṅkhya not atheistic.

So far as I know, it has been almost universally assumed that early Sāṅkhya, like that of later times, denies the existence of any Supreme Soul (Brahman, or God). This has been questioned only by Dahlmann (*Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, 5 ff. *et passim*), to my knowledge. And Dahlmann cannot be said to have proved his point. He hardly attempts to do so, merely stating, rather dogmatically it seems to me, that “epic Sāṅkhya” is not atheistic. It does not surprise me that he has found few, if any, followers on this point. Even Oldenberg, who is one of

those most inclined to emphasize differences between earlier and later Sāṅkhya, speaks of the former as not recognizing an *īśvara* (God), without giving any proofs however.¹⁰ If this were really the case, it would militate strongly against my interpretation. Here would be a definite metaphysical doctrine, which would set Sāṅkhya off against other "systems," particularly Yoga. This is in fact the most striking difference in metaphysics between the later Sāṅkhya and the later Yoga, which is theistic; and the difference is assumed by all, except Dahlmann, to apply also to early times. So notably Hopkins, 104 ff. It is, to be sure, admitted (e. g. by Hopkins, 137) that there are passages in the epic which represent Sāṅkhya as teaching a belief in Brahman, or God. But these expressions are explained as distortions or misrepresentations of the original Sāṅkhya view.

Where, then, do we find that "original" atheistic view expressed? I believe: *nowhere*. A study of the epic and other early materials (mostly collected by Hopkins) has convinced me that there is not a single passage in which disbelief in Brahman or God is attributed to Sāṅkhya.

There are, however, a few passages which have been interpreted as attributing such views to Sāṅkhya. Hopkins (104) regards Mbh. 12. 11039 as the clearest of these. We must consider this crucial passage at length.

In 12. 11037 Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhīṣma to explain the difference between Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Bhīṣma replies: (11038) "Both Sāṅkhyas and Yogas praise their own as the best means (*kāraṇa*)."

(11039) *anīśvaraḥ katham mucyed ity evaṁ śatrukarsaṇa
vadanti kāraṇam śrāiṣṭham*¹¹ *yogāḥ samyag manīṣiṇaḥ.*

(11040) *vadanti kāraṇam cedam sāṅkhyāḥ samyag dvijātayaḥ.*

[I shall interpret these lines below. The text proceeds:] "Who-so understands all courses (methods, or goals, *gatīḥ*) in the world, and renounces the objects of sense, (11041) after leaving the body is assuredly saved; thus and not otherwise the great sages say is the Sāṅkhya view of salvation (*mokṣadarśana*) . . .

(11043) The Yogas rely on immediate (mystic) perception

¹⁰ NGGW, ph.-hist. Kl., 1917, 231.

¹¹ Read *śreṣṭham*? B has *kāraṇaśrāiṣṭhyam*.

(*pratyakṣahetavo*, cf. Hopkins, 105, note 1, and my remarks page 42, note 49); the Sāṅkhyas rest on accepted teaching (*śāstraviniścayāḥ*). And both of these opinions I consider true. . . . (11044) Followed according to instructions, both of them lead to the supreme goal. (11045) Common to both are purity together with penance and compassion to all creatures; the maintenance of strict vows is common to both; the opinions (*darśanam*) are not the same in them."

Hopkins, with (I believe) all previous interpreters but Dahlmann, thinks (a) that 11039a means "how can one be saved without God?"; (b) that this question is attributed exclusively to the Yogas as distinguished from the Sāṅkhyas; and (c) that it implies that the latter are atheists.¹² Hopkins also says: "It is to be noticed that this (11045) is the end of the explanation. There is not the slightest hint that the anīśvara or atheistic Sāṅkhyas believe in God." This statement is a bit hasty, I think. Let us see what follows. In 11046 Yudhiṣṭhira, not a little puzzled, inquires: "If vows, purity and compassion, and also the fruits (of the two methods), are common to both, tell me why the views are not the same?" Remember that his original question (11037) was for the *difference* between the two. Evidently he feels that so far no essential difference has been mentioned, but only resemblances; for the fact that the Yogas rely on immediate perception, the Sāṅkhyas on instruction, deals merely with the kind of evidence used by each. If Bhīṣma had already told him that the Sāṅkhyas were atheistic, the Yogas theistic, would he have put such a question as this? Surely that would be a sufficiently striking difference of *darśana*!—Let us proceed. The real answer to Yudhiṣṭhira's original question, repeated in 11046, comes now. In 11047-98 Bhīṣma describes what Yoga means (the supernatural powers of the Yogin; concentration [*samādhāna*] and fixation [*dhāraṇā*], etc.; not a word of *knowledge*). At the end of this, in 11099, Yudhiṣṭhira says: "You have told me all about the Yoga-way (*-mārga*); now tell me about the method (*vidhi*) that is in Sāṅkhya. For you know all the *knowledge* that is in the three worlds." Then in 11100 ff. comes the exposition of the Sāṅkhya method, in

¹² Dahlmann, *Sāṅkhya-Philosophie* 169 ff., agrees on a and b, but dissents from c. I dissent on all three points, as will presently appear.

which the *Leitmotif* is *knowledge* all the way thru; knowledge of the most varied assortment of things: first of the *viṣayas* (11102 ff.), and the suffering that invariably comes to those devoted to them (11108); “those who are endowed with knowledge, *jñāna-vijñāna*, gain salvation” (11114); then knowledge of the construction of the material body and mind, and the separateness of the soul therefrom, also *knowledge of the nature of God* (11120), of the worthlessness and transitoriness of the world (11155 ff.), and of many other things. In 11158 “the wise Sāṅkhyas abandon the love of children (or creatures, *prajā*) by means of the great, all-pervading *knowledge-method of the Sāṅkhyas* (*jñānayogena sāṅkhyena*),” etc.; in 11159-60 they “cut by the sword of knowledge (*jñānaśastreṇa*) and the weapon of penance (*tapodaṇḍena*)” the connexions with *rajas*, *tamas*, and even *sattva*, the best of the three material *guṇas*, which is after all “born of contact with the body,” and so (11160-8) they cross over the “sea of suffering” by the “discipline (or method) of knowledge” (*jñānayoga*) and are carried thru several mythic stages (11169 ff.) to the Paramātman, whence they do not return (11175); in 11193 this imperishable supreme Ātman “has the nature of Nārāyaṇa,” that is God (*nārāyaṇāt-mānam*); “freed from good and evil and entered into that *anā-maya*, *aguṇa* Paramātman, one does not return” (11194); so (11197) “the Sāṅkhyas of great knowledge go to the supreme goal *by this knowledge*; there is no other knowledge like it”; and (11198) “Have no doubt of this: the Sāṅkhya-knowledge is rated the supreme; it is the eternal, steadfast, full, everlasting Brahman”—described ecstatically and at great length in the following verses, in thoroly Upaniṣadic terms. In 11203 “Sāṅkhya is the form (incarnation, *mūrti*) of this Formless One (Brahman).” In 11211 Nārāyaṇa (God) supports (*dhārayate*) this ancient, supreme Sāṅkhya-knowledge.

In all this there is certainly not a hint of atheism. On the contrary, there are abundant allusions to belief in both a personal God and an impersonal, Upaniṣadic Brahman or Supreme Soul. And—be it added—this is quite the usual way in which Sāṅkhya is described in the epic. For no one can deny that it is at least *frequently* made to imply a belief in either the impersonal Brahman or a personal God (no clear distinction is

usually made between the two). Now, I should hesitate to separate the description of Yoga in 11047 ff. and of Sāṅkhya in 11100 ff. from 11037-45, as Professor Hopkins does. These passages profess to contain the answer to 11046, which seems to me clearly Yudhiṣṭhira's reminder of his still unanswered question in 11037. I see no reason for refusing to accept the text at its face value, except an unwillingness to admit that Sāṅkhya is not atheistic.

To return to the crucial 11039-40. If 11039 means that the Yogas accuse the Sāṅkhyas of atheism, it is seen to be inconsistent not only with most (I believe, all) other statements on the subject in the epic, but specifically with the account given of the Sāṅkhya in the sequel to this particular passage. But if it does not mean this, what does it mean? Dahlmann (*l. c.*, p. 169) thinks it means "The Yogas say, 'How can one be saved without (the help of) God?'" He identifies Yoga with the way of devotion, *bhakti*. Sāṅkhya, he says, is not indeed atheistic, but seeks salvation by pure theoretic knowledge, while Yoga seeks it by reliance on the personal help of God. His interpretation has won no adherents to my knowledge, and seems to me unacceptable. My belief is that *anīśvaraḥ* in 11039 means simply the Soul, and that the passage should be translated:

"The wise Yogas declare in clear form the best means (*kāraṇa*) how the soul may be saved. And the Sāṅkhya brahmans (too) declare in clear form this means" (that is, the means "how the soul may be saved"; *idaṁ* is to be taken as referring back to 11039, not forward with Hopkins and Deussen; the same question expresses the aim of both Sāṅkhya and Yoga).

In other words, both Sāṅkhya and Yoga are simply ways of gaining salvation for the soul. This is all that the passage means.

anīśvara means "having no lord, supreme." Like *an-uttama* etc., it is a mere synonym for *para*, *parama*, and (like any word of similar meaning) may be applied not only to the Supreme Soul (Brahman, or God), but also to the human soul, which is regarded as ultimately one with the Supreme Soul, not only in the Upaniṣads but also in epic philosophy. For instance, the Gītā (15. 8) applies the word *īśvara*, "Lord," to the human soul, which enters and leaves the body, and which in the preceding

verse has been called the *jīvabhūta* and differentiated from God, of whom it is there said to be a "part." The words *īśvara* and *anīśvara*, like *uttama* and *anuttama*, are synonyms; "the lord" and "that which has no lord" both mean the same thing. In Mbh. 12. 11408 the "twenty-fifth" (the human soul) is also called *anīśvara*, "the supreme" (cf. next paragraph). The same epithet applies distinctly to the individual as distinguished from the universal soul in 12. 8957, where Deussen renders "keinen Höhern über sich wissend."¹³ Finally, as an absolutely conclusive proof that *anīśvara* can mean "supreme," I refer to Kumārasambhava 2. 9, where it (with *nirīśvara* as a v. l.) is an epithet of Brahmā.

Hopkins (126) understands *anīśvara* at Mbh. 12. 11408 (just referred to) essentially as I do; but nevertheless finds in this passage too an implication that Sāṅkhya denies a Supreme Soul. I cannot agree with him. In fact, it seems to me that the preceding half of the same verse clearly attributes to Sāṅkhya (whose views are here being set forth) a belief in an *īśvara* (God? see note 15 below). This description of Sāṅkhya begins with 11393: "Now I will explain the Sāṅkhya-knowledge." This is made to include knowledge of the evolvents of Prakṛti (11394-7) and how they devolve back again into the unmanifest Prakṛti, which is therefore "unity in dissolution, plurality when it is creative" (11398-11400). The Soul (*mahān ātmā*, 11403) is the overseer, *adhiṣṭhātar* (11401, 4) or the *kṣetrajña* (11405-6) of Prakṛti, the *kṣetra*; it is called *puruṣa* when it enters into the evolvents of the unmanifest, *avyakta* = (the unitary, unevolved) *prakṛti* (11405); it is also called the 25th principle (11406). Those who have knowledge distinguish soul from Prakṛti, material nature (11406). "Knowledge (*jñāna*) and the object of knowledge (*jñeya*) are two different things; knowledge is the unmanifest (= *prakṛti*), the object of knowledge is the 25th (the soul)."¹⁴ The next verse, 11408, is the crucial one. It reads:

¹³ Hopkins, 106: "not having (the senses as) a master." I do not get this idea from the word; it would seem to me to need to be proved by other passages, which are not adduced, and which I am unable to discover. Dahlmann's translation, criticized by Hopkins, l. c., is quite untenable.

¹⁴ This verse, 11407, forces Deussen to the use of exclamation-points,

avyaktam kṣetram ity uktam tathā sattvaṁ tatheśvaraḥ
anīśvaram atattvaṁ ca tattvaṁ tat pañcaviṁśakam.

“Unmanifest the field (= *prakṛti*) is declared to be, likewise *sattva*, likewise the Lord;¹⁵ lordless (supreme) and un-principled (or, a non-principle) is that 25th principle (soul).” Then in 11409 it is repeated that all this is what the Sāṅkhyas say. And by this *knowledge* they are saved and are not reborn (11412-4); while others, lacking this knowledge, are reborn again and again (11415-6).—Now Hopkins says that in 11408 “the view of a Lord-principle is distinctly opposed.” He renders the verse: “It is said that the Unmanifest comprehends not only the field of knowledge . . . but also *sattva* and Lord; the Sāṅkhyas-system holds, however, that the twenty-fifth principle has no Lord and is itself the topic that is apart from topics.” In other words, he sees in *ity uktam*, 11408a, a quotation of a rejected, non-Sāṅkhyas view, and thus he reads the *īśvara* out of “Sāṅkhyas.” But there is no “however” in the Sanskrit, and I see no trace of opposition between 11408ab and the surrounding (Sāṅkhyas) doctrines. On the contrary: the

and indeed sounds startling at first. Cf. 11426, where the second half of 11407 is repeated verbatim, with this addition: “Likewise knowledge is the unmanifest, the knower (*viñātā*) is the 25th (the soul).” The explanation seems to me to be this: knowledge is here felt as a process, a sort of action, and so material. (For the soul is absolutely inactive; it “neither acts nor suffers.”) The object of knowledge is the soul, for it must be “known” in order that salvation may be gained. But the soul is also the knower. It must know itself; and yet the actual process of knowledge, like any *process*, pertains to matter. The paradox is furthered by the strong tendency to contrast *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* with each other in every possible way; what the one is, the other is not; almost any contrasting pair of terms may be allotted to them, one apiece.

¹⁵ On *sattva* and God as “unmanifest” cf. Hopkins, 121, with footnotes. *Sattva* frequently occupies a special position, superior to *rajas* and *tamas*, in epic speculation; it is often thought of as a kind of abstract (“unmanifest”) state of existence. Indeed, it has pretensions to serve as an equivalent for the material *avyakta*, the primal *Prakṛti* itself, as the principle opposed to the soul, *puruṣa*, *kṣetrajña*; it is clearly so used in 12. 7103 and 9020; and cf. 12. 8678. God (if *īśvara* means God, of which more presently) is of course (at least in his supernal form) also “unmanifest”; even the *human* soul is *avyakta* (Gītā 2. 25 etc.). Since the Sāṅkhyas do not think of denying God,

phrase *ity uktam* is used regularly, and particularly in this very passage, of doctrines that are accepted by the speaker. In stanzas 11404-7 we find doctrines, recognized by all as Sāṅkhya, introduced successively by *iti procyate*, *iti cocyate*, *iti kathyate*, *ucyate*, *ity uktam*, *ucyate*, *ity uktam* again. Then in the very next verse, 11408, we find another *ity uktam*; can it be that it suddenly introduces a view rejected by the author as non-Sāṅkhya? Surely there would be no reason for thinking so, had it not been considered desirable to remove the *īśvara* from a statement of Sāṅkhya doctrine.

The earliest occurrences of the word Sāṅkhya.

I have said that a study of the actual use of the word Sāṅkhya in the earliest period seems to me to make it clear that to the authors of that period the word meant not any metaphysical system, but a way of salvation, namely by knowledge; and that any other terms (such as Yoga), with which it may be bracketed or contrasted, mean other *ways of salvation*—not other metaphysical systems. This idea seems to me to act like the “clearing-nut” on the muddy waters of epic speculation. Many scholars (notably Garbe) have been inclined to throw up their hands in despair over what they consider the “confusion,” the *Wirrwarr*, of the “systems” of philosophy in the later Upaniṣads and the epic. It seems not to have occurred to them that the texts themselves do not profess to teach, under the names of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, “systems” in our sense—logically developed structures of metaphysical truth. Yet this is what the texts tell us quite plainly. They seem confused to westerners

it is entirely natural to find Him mentioned when a list of “unmanifest” things is being given. Nor is this, from the point of view of epic speculation (illustrated over and over again in the Gītā), at all inconsistent with calling the (individual) soul “supreme”; the word *anīśvara* is chosen to express this idea precisely because the word *īśvara* immediately precedes; no Hindu could miss such a chance for a verbal paradox. Just so the same line says the soul is an *atattvam tattvam*, a “principle that is (or has) no principle.”—It is possible, however, that *īśvara* here does not mean God at all, but simply the individual soul, as in Gītā 15. 8, quoted above. In that case this passage could not be used to prove that Sāṅkhya is (or may be) theistic; but still less could it be used to prove that it is atheistic.

only, or mainly, because their aims are not those which westerners assume they should be. If and in so far as there tends to be a general agreement of direction in the metaphysical beliefs which are associated with the term Sāṅkhya, this means only that to that extent the metaphysical beliefs of all Hindus of the period, or at least of all whose beliefs are recorded as orthodox and acceptable in the Sanskrit texts of the period, tended in that direction. *Any* formula of metaphysical truth, provided that *knowledge* thereof was conceived to tend towards salvation, might be called "Sāṅkhya." What may be opposed to Sāṅkhya is not any theory of abstract truth, but a view that salvation is to be gained by some other method than knowledge, e. g. by devotion to God, or by Yoga (which we shall try to define later).

Let us now see just how the word Sāṅkhya is used in early texts; and first of all in the Upaniṣads.

If we limit ourselves to the six or seven earliest Upaniṣads, the answer is easy: it is not used at all. Even if we include the second half-dozen, completing the baker's dozen included in Hume's translation,¹⁶ we find only a single occurrence of the word. This is Śvet. U. 6. 13, which may then be considered probably the oldest record of the word Sāṅkhya. It reads:

nityo nityānām cetanaś cetanānām
eko bahūnām yo vidadhāti kāmān
tat kāraṇam sāṅkhyayogādhigamyam
jñātvā devam mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ.

"The eternal of eternal, the intelligent of intelligents, the one of many, who brings desires to pass—by knowing that divine Cause, which is attainable by Sāṅkhya and Yoga, one is freed from all bonds."

It could hardly be stated more plainly that both Sāṅkhya and Yoga are ways of salvation. Incidentally it is clear that salvation (by either Sāṅkhya or Yoga) is here conceived as attainment of the first Cause, which is rather definitely conceived in personal terms (called *deva*, and referred to by masculine adjectives and pronouns, in spite of the neuter gender of *kāraṇa*, which would make neuter epitheta more natural). Thus in our

¹⁶ *The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1921.

very first meeting with the word we find the state of things which has been interpreted as a "confusion of Sāṅkhya and Vedānta" or a "departure from the original Sāṅkhya"—these interpretations being due to the assumption, utterly baseless as it seems to me, that Sāṅkhya originally denied a world-soul. The truth is, I think, that even if the term implied any definite beliefs at all, which I think it did not, a denial of the world-soul can certainly not have been one of them.¹⁷ Is it not strange that from the very beginning, and for many centuries, we find only the "confusions" and "blends" and "distortions" of the "original" systems, which crop out in their pristine purity only four or five centuries P. C., or (in the case of Vedānta, cf. below, page 33) perhaps even later?

The Śvet. U. does not attempt to tell us the difference between Sāṅkhya and Yoga; it assumes that as known. Hardly more informing, but equally favorable to my view, are the other references in still later Upaniṣads (all of which may probably be assumed to be not much, if any, older than the average of the Mahābhārata; they belong really with the epic references). Garbha U. 4 speaks of Sāṅkhya and Yoga as destroying evil and bringing salvation. Prāṇāgnihotra U. 1 says "salvation is possible even without the Agnihotra (i. e. without orthodox ritual performances) and without Sāṅkhya and Yoga;" again, obviously, just ways of salvation. Cūlikā U. 14 speaks of the "guṇa-less soul, *puruṣa*, of the Sāṅkhya"—implying that part of the supreme "knowledge" by which Sāṅkhya aims at salvation is the knowledge of the separateness of soul from body (which is often stated at great length in the epic); this is, of course, far from implying that that is all there is to "Sāṅkhya knowledge." Finally, the very late Muktikā U. (which con-

¹⁷ My interpretation dissolves completely all the "difficulties" found in the Śvet. U. passage by Deussen (*Sechzig Upanishads*, 290 f.), and makes it equally unnecessary to suppose with Hopkins, *JAOS* 22. 382 f., that we have in it a theistic "Sāṅkhya-Yoga" system, different from the "atheistic" Sāṅkhya (and also from the Yoga?). The frequent statements that "Sāṅkhya and Yoga are one" mean that they both lead to the same goal, salvation; and usually the very passages which make that statement also make clear the difference of *method* between the two. I do not think there is any "Sāṅkhya-Yoga system" in any other sense, either early or late.

tains a list of 108 Upaniṣads, ending with itself, and which presents Rāma as a divine incarnation) mentions (1. 16, and prose at the end of 1) Sāṅkhya and Yoga among methods by which men (*muniśreṣṭhāḥ, kecit, anye*) think salvation may be gained (*muktir . . . iti cakṣire . . . sāṅkhyayogena, bhaktiyogena, etc.; kāivalyamuktir uktā etc.*), along with *bhakti* and others.

The Kāuṭīliya Arthaśāstra (1. 2; ed. 1909, p. 6 f.) names Sāṅkhya, Yoga, and Lokāyata as constituting Ānvīkṣakī, "Philosophy," which is described as "an illumination of all sciences, a means for all works, a support for all duties (*dharma*)." This sort of magniloquence cannot be taken very seriously; it certainly tells us little about the real objects and character of "Philosophy," and nothing at all about the difference between the three terms which it groups under that heading. We may therefore dismiss it, without seriously considering the question whether the Kāuṭīliya is really a work of the time of Candragupta Māurya, or whether, as some authorities (including Winternitz, *Gesch. d. ind. Lit.*, 3. 518 ff., especially 523) believe, it dates from a much later time—in which case it would hardly be very pertinent to our present investigation.

Otherwise, the only early occurrences of the name Sāṅkhya, so far as I know, are in the Mahābhārata itself.

First, as to the Bhagavad Gītā. Here it seems to me there can be no question that Sāṅkhya is the way of salvation by knowledge (*jñāna*), and nothing else. The most crucial passages, 3. 3 and 5. 1-6, have been treated above. The Gītā contains three other occurrences of the word Sāṅkhya. In 2. 39 we read: "This point of view (*buddhi*) has been declared for you in the Sāṅkhya; but hear this in the Yoga." The (preceding) Sāṅkhya view must refer to the dissertation on the separateness of soul from body, knowledge of which is necessary to salvation; the passage ended at 2. 30, the intervening verses being parenthetical;¹⁸ they have no relation to either Sāṅkhya or Yoga, according to *any* definition. The same is true of the immediately following verses, which must likewise be parenthetical; they contain an attack on ritualism. The treatment of Yoga (as regularly in the Gītā, the way of salvation by disciplined

¹⁸ N. B.: *parenthetical*, not necessarily interpolated.

activity, dutiful action with indifference to results) begins with 2. 47, and continues thruout the rest of the chapter.

Gītā 13. 24: "Some by meditation (*dhyāna*) behold the Self (*ātman*) by the Self (or, by themselves) in the Self; others by the Sāṅkhya discipline, and others by the discipline of action (*anye sāṅkhyena yogena karmayogena cāpare*)." The discipline of action, *karma-yoga*, is what is otherwise known in the Gītā as Yoga for short, viz. the method just mentioned by me in the last paragraph. Sāṅkhya is not defined in this passage. But obviously it is ways of salvation that we are dealing with; all those mentioned are regarded as possible methods of reaching the common goal, "seeing the Self," which produces release.

Lastly, in Gītā 18. 13 the Sāṅkhya doctrine (*kṛtānta*) is quoted as authority for the five "causes" (*kāraṇa*) or elements in the performance of any action, which are named in the next verse as the material basis (*adhiṣṭhāna*), the doer (*kartar*), the various organs or means of action (*karana*), the various movements (*ceṣṭā*), and fate (*dāiva*). Now the later, systematic Sāṅkhya knows nothing of any such group as this; and so Śankara and Madhusūdana (quoted by Garbe *ad loc.*) felt forced to assume that Sāṅkhya here means Vedānta! Garbe says: "Was in diesen Versen gesagt ist, lässt sich gut auf der Basis des [later] Sāṅkhya begreifen." Perhaps. But it is equally easy to understand it merely as (here regarded as) a part of that supreme "knowledge" which is accepted by the Sāṅkhyas as the true means of salvation. As I have said above, the Sāṅkhyas are the people who tend to promise salvation to any one who *knows any* truth that for the moment is regarded as specially profound or important. Of course it is not always the same truth in different passages. Some such truths are, or seem to us to be, inconsistent with each other. But he who *knows*—is saved. If you do not believe that, you are not a Sāṅkhya. The importance for salvation of the truth here stated seems to be indicated in 18. 16, 17; the doer, *kartar*, is not the Self; he who realizes this is saved.

So much for the Gītā. It would be impossible here to discuss all passages in the Mbh. which mention Sāṅkhya. I believe, however, that there are few, if any, significant passages outside of the Gītā and the important Mokṣadharmā section of the twelfth

book. And in the following I shall limit myself to this latter section, treating all passages in it which seem to me to throw any light on the meaning of Sāṅkhya and especially on the difference between Sāṅkhya and Yoga.

A good example is the passage discussed above, 12. 11100 ff., in which the constant *Leitmotif* of knowledge is modulated in the most various ways; and it is emphatically knowledge which brings salvation, while in the companion piece (11047-98) on Yoga nothing is said of knowledge; other methods are followed. I have referred also to 12. 11393 ff., another description of Sāṅkhya, culminating in the promise of salvation by true knowledge (11415 f.). Again in 12. 9877-9913 we find a description of knowledge of the difference between matter and soul, with the evolvents of the former; this knowledge is identified as Sāṅkhya and as leading to Brahman = salvation in 9912 f.: "When the body is destroyed, the Embodied (soul) attains the state of Brahman (*brahmatvam upagacchati*); for (the above-described) Sāṅkhya-knowledge (*-jñāna*) is designed to destroy good and evil (deeds, which result in further existence); for in the destruction thereof, (and so) in becoming Brahman (*brah-mabhāve*), they see the highest goal (release)."

Epic "Sāṅkhya" is Brahmaistic.

Interesting is 12. 11347 ff. Here it is first said that "Sāṅkhya and Yoga are one," and in 11348-11367 views are set forth which are declared to be accepted by *both* of them. These views include the absolute distinction between Soul and Material Nature (*prakṛti*), which is emphatically insisted upon. *Prakṛti*, tho having no characteristics (*liṅga*) itself (as *avyakta*, the primal unmanifest matter), is known by its evolvents, which have characteristics, just as the invisible Seasons of the year are known by the fruits and flowers produced by each. The Soul is absolutely distinct from Material Nature and its qualities; it is eternal, infinite, free from suffering, and only owing to delusion seems to be mixed up in the qualities of Material Nature (11356). The Soul, to gain salvation, must free himself from these qualities; then he will see the Highest (*para*), which is declared by Sāṅkhya and Yoga to be higher than *buddhi* (the highest material evolvent), and is realized by get-

ting rid of the Unawakened (*abuddha*; 11358-9). The Unawakened is the unmanifest (*avyakta*, the primal Material Nature), the qualityless (*aguṇa*) is the lord (*īśvara*), and this qualityless lord is the eternal overseer (*adhiṣṭhātar*; 11360). The wise who are skilled in Sāṅkhya and Yoga and seek the highest perceive the 25th (the soul) after Material Nature and its qualities (11361).¹⁹ "Unity is the imperishable; plurality is the perishable" (*ekatvam akṣaram, nānātvam kṣaram*; 11364); that is, the world of plurality is (not unreal, or false, but) finite, and rests on the basis of a greater, more fundamental unity, which is not finite but eternal. "When, standing upon (= rising superior to) the twenty-five (principles, including soul as well as material nature; *pañcaviṃśatiniṣṭha*) he (the soul) moves forward in the straight and clear way (*samyak pravartate*), then he sees unity and no plurality (literally, unity is his view and plurality is not-[his-]view; 11365)."²⁰ A distinction must be made between the 25 principles (*tattvāni*; note that the soul is the 25th of these; they are obviously the "perishable plurality" mentioned in 11364) and that which is unprincipled (*nistattva*) and above all the 25, eternal, and above the whole crowd of the finite creation (11367). Of course the individual soul is ultimately and really one with the One; but whether in any higher sense than everything else (even matter), is not made clear at this point.

Now, all this—which is fundamentally Upaniṣadic Brahmanism (to adopt a convenient term first used, I believe, by Hopkins, 101, note 3)—is repeatedly declared to be accepted by *both* Sāṅkhya and Yoga. For it deals only with what the goal of man should be—*not with the way of reaching it*. To be saved, man must get rid of Prakṛti and "see the Highest."

¹⁹ I am unable to agree with Professor Hopkins, 125, in seeing a contrast between 11361 and 11359; and I hardly think that *sarvaśaḥ* (in 11359) can mean "as a whole," implying (as that English phrase does; this is the whole basis of Hopkins's interpretation) that some are excluded. On the contrary *sarvaśaḥ* seems to me to mean "absolutely all together," without any exception.

²⁰ A somewhat different interpretation in Hopkins, 124. The "plurality" referred to seems to me not, or not merely, a plurality of individual souls; it is exactly the same as in the Kāṭha U. 4. 11, very appositely quoted by Hopkins in a footnote—"the separateness . . . of any part of Brahman from the whole." Cf. below, pages 26 ff., 32.

On this both methods, and in fact *all* methods of salvation approved in the Mbh., agree. But how can one best attain this end? It is on this that Sāṅkhya and Yoga differ; and our passage now proceeds at once to explain the difference, in response to the interlocutor's definite request, 11372. The method of Yoga (by *dhyāna*, with *prāṇāyāma* and *ekāgratā manasaḥ*, etc., see below) is described in 11374-92; that of Sāṅkhya, by *knowledge*, in 11393-11417 (above, pp. 12-14). In all the passage 11346-67, stating the fundamental basis of both Sāṅkhya and Yoga, there was not a word of knowledge, or *dhyāna*, or *prāṇāyāma*, or any other *means* of accomplishing the end. Only the end itself—what salvation is—was described.

"The truth" is taught by Sāṅkhya, but accepted also by Yoga.

Since Sāṅkhya believes in salvation by pure knowledge, in the theory that by simply knowing the absolute truth one may gain salvation, it is natural that what is regarded as the absolute truth should be thought of as in a special sense the property of Sāṅkhya. The importance of truth is much greater if knowledge thereof is the direct and immediate means of salvation, than if some other method is to be tried. Other methods, such as Yoga, do not necessarily, or usually, conceive truth as anything different from truth *à la* Sāṅkhya; they merely teach other methods of gaining salvation than pure knowledge alone. So in 12. 11348-67 Yoga as well as Sāṅkhya accepts (as we have just seen) the truth there set forth, but bases on it a different procedure (11373 ff.) from that advocated by Sāṅkhya (11393 ff.). This is made perhaps even clearer in the latter part of the same passage, 11461 ff. The speaker says (11461) he has now declared both Sāṅkhya (in 11393 ff.) and Yoga (11373 ff.); the same teaching (as to truth; *śāstra*) that is declared by Sāṅkhya is also the view (*darśana*) of Yoga. But (11462) knowledge (*jñāna*) is the Sāṅkhyas' means of enlightenment (= release; *prabodhanakara*). And (11463) "in this (Sāṅkhya) teaching, as well as in the Veda, are the forerunners (*purāḥsarāḥ*; B. °*raḥ*) of the Yogas;" ²¹ that is, Yoga accepts the facts as set forth in the Sāṅkhya and the Veda (which presumably means particularly the Upaniṣads).

²¹ I understand this verse essentially as Hopkins does, 134; otherwise Deussen.

Sāṅkhya does not reject the One (Supreme) Soul.

The sequel to this passage (adhyāya 310 of C., 308 of B.) needs special consideration because it develops the idea of the "twenty-sixth" principle, which Hopkins, 133 ff., identifies with the "personal Lord" and says is denied in Sāṅkhya, but upheld in Yoga. I am unable to agree with him as to this distinction. It seems to me that the passage in question is straight Sāṅkhya. This I deduce from the following evidence. (1) Sāṅkhya is named as an authority in it (in 11483, verse 17 of the adhyāya; for Hopkins's interpretation of this see below, note 25), while Yoga is not. (2) *Knowledge* is constantly stressed thruout the adhyāya, while the usual Yoga methods (*ekāgratā manasaḥ, prāṇāyāma*, etc.) are not mentioned.—I do not doubt that the truths here set forth are understood as acceptable to Yoga too;²² but the method here implied is the Sāṅkhya method.²³

As to the "26th" principle, it is merely a convenient means of distinguishing the enlightened soul from the soul that is as yet unenlightened (*budhyamāna*, seeking enlightenment). In 11476 we are definitely told that when the (formerly unenlightened, *budhyamāna*) soul (the 25th) reaches enlightenment

²² In fact, a later statement of the same theory, 11778-80 and 11793-11806, attributes it definitely to both Sāṅkhya and Yoga (11780, 11802, 11810). Again, as repeatedly above, they assume the same facts, but while Sāṅkhya bases salvation on the mere knowledge of these truths, Yoga uses other methods.—Hopkins, 138, says that at this place (B. 318. 86 = C. 11810) these doctrines are represented "as being newly inculcated, and especially designed for those who desire emancipation, in contrast to the Sāṅkhyas and Yogas, who are content with their own doctrines." But 11810 seems hardly to support this: *sāṅkhyāḥ sarve sāṅkhyadharme ratās ca, tadvad yogā (C. yogo) yogadharme ratās ca, ye oāpy anye mokṣakāmā manuṣyās, teṣāṃ etad darśanam jñānadṛṣṭam*. "Both all Sāṅkhyas . . . and likewise Yogas . . . and also all other men who desire salvation—this view is that perceived in the knowledge of (all of) them." That is, Sāṅkhyas, Yogas, and all others, who seek salvation by any method whatsoever, accept these truths. They differ only as to the means of reaching the common goal.

²³ Hopkins, 133, says this adhyāya comes "after the speaker says he has disposed of the Sāṅkhya system" (and refers to Yoga alone). So far as I can see the only basis for this statement is 11461, where "the speaker" says that he has explained both Sāṅkhya and Yoga. (He refers to 11393 ff. and 11373 ff. respectively.)

(*buddhi*), "then *as 26th* he goes to *buddha*-hood." Of course this 26th, the enlightened soul, is especially thought of as "Lord," *īśvara*, for it is only as the 26th, in a state of enlightenment, that the soul attains its true freedom and realizes its true unity with the One. But there is no difference between the 26th and the 25th except the stage of enlightenment attained. As Oldenberg aptly says (*NGGW*, 1917, 237) the soul's place in the enumeration of principles is split in two, to provide recognition for a certain qualified difference between the unenlightened and the enlightened soul—without in the least denying their ultimate identity with each other and with the Universal One, the World-Soul (which, when the distinction is made at all, is of course thought of in connexion with the 26th rather than with the 25th; that goes without saying).

To show the basis for this, and incidentally to show that what we are dealing with is Sāṅkhya rather than Yoga, we must examine some parts of the passage in question. We begin with the end of the preceding *adhyāya* (C. 309, B. 307), with the verse immediately following 11463, quoted above. (11464) "No principle higher than the 25th (the soul) is declared, O king. But the supreme principle of the Sāṅkhya has been correctly described as (11465) the (soul) that is enlightened, and that from a state-of-not-perfect-enlightenment becomes enlightened (*buddham apratibuddhatvād budhyamānam ca*) in truth (or, in regard to the principles, *tattvataḥ*). The (soul) becoming-enlightened and that-is-enlightened is declared to be (also) the substance of Yoga teaching" (so that there is, as stated, no difference in the Sāṅkhya and Yoga views of truth).²⁴ Here ends the *adhyāya* C. 309 (B. 307). The first verse (11466)

²⁴ Hopkins, 134, takes 11465ab as referring to Yoga, not to Sāṅkhya (as I do with Deussen); and he identifies *buddha*, "the enlightened (soul)," with the "Lord-spirit" exclusively, for which I can see no ground. All Hindu systems surely believe in the possibility of *buddha*-hood for individuals. Of course, the individual that becomes *buddha* thereby realizes his true unity with Brahman or the "Lord-spirit," a unity which has existed all along, had he but been able to realize it. In any case, this would not from the epic point of view constitute a difference between Sāṅkhya and Yoga, since as Hopkins points out, 134 note 1, the "personal God" is identified with "the 25th" in epic Sāṅkhya. In other words, the 25th, the 26th, and the World-Soul are really one.

of the next adhyāya promises an explanation of the terms just used. The soul, as *budhyamāna*, which may perhaps be rendered "seeking enlightenment" (really "becoming enlightened," or also "being conscious," cf. below; Deussen, "der des Erwachens Fähige"), "makes himself many" and creates all beings; as such (in the pluralistic, empiric universe) he is not enlightened (11467), tho absolutely different from Material Nature, which is permanently unenlightenable (*apratibudhyaka*, 11469, with B. [C. °*buddhaka*]; cf. 11804 f. for the triple distinction between "the unenlightened [*prakṛti*], the becoming-enlightened [25th, unenlightened soul], and the enlightened [26th, perfected soul]"). When the soul realizes this difference between himself and Material Nature, he becomes free from the latter (11475), and, enlightened by supreme, pure, spotless *knowledge*, he attains as 26th to the state of enlightenment (11476). "Seized with the knowledge 'I am the 26th,' wise, free from age and death (11481), by the mere abstract power (of this knowledge) he undoubtedly goes to identity (with the Supreme; he is then the 26th; 11482)."

(11482cd) ṣaḍviṁśena prabuddhena budhyamāno (C. buddha°)
 'py abuddhimān

(11483) etan nānātvam ity uktam sāṅkhyaśrutinidarśanāt
 cetanena sametasya pañcaviṁśatikasya ha

(11484) ekatvaṁ vāi bhavaty asya yadā buddhyā na (C. nu)
 budhyate.

These lines I render: "Tho being awakened (or, by a kind of word-play, being conscious) by the awakened 26th, it (the perfected soul) is lacking in consciousness; (for) this (viz. consciousness) is (implies) plurality; so it is declared by the expositions of Sāṅkhya and holy revelation. Of this 25th, united with pure intelligence (*cetana*), unity results only when it is not conscious with consciousness (*buddhi*)."
 Here, as elsewhere in this chapter, we find a sort of pun on the two meanings of the root *budh*: (1) to become enlightened, and (2) to be conscious (of something; the object is *prakṛti* and its evolvents). This consciousness is a material process (cf. pp. 12 f., note 14), function of the organ *buddhi*, an evolvent of *prakṛti*. As such it must be got rid of by the enlightened soul. And further,

there can be no consciousness after attainment of perfection (= oneness), because after perfect enlightenment the soul is completely merged in the One; there is only the One unity, no longer any plurality, no difference of subject and object, and consequently no consciousness. It is exactly the same theory that is set forth by Yājñavalkya to Māitreyī, Brh. Ār. U. (M.) 4. 5. 13-25 (which might be the very *śruti* meant by 11483b): only in the finite, pluralistic, unenlightened world does "one see another, one hear another" etc.; but "when all has become just the soul, by what should he see what?" etc. (So also Mbh. 12. 7973; see below, p. 30.) There is no question of God vs. multiplicity of individual spirits here. It is the old, Upaniṣadic notion of a plurality in the empiric, finite world, but an underlying unity, realized by the enlightened, in which there is no longer any plurality, nor any consciousness, the attribute of plurality.²⁵

Again in 11550-11647 we have a long series of metaphysical speculations, stated (11550cd) to be assumed by both Sāṅkhya and Yoga. It includes, along with many other things, the usual theory of the evolvents of Material Nature, and the Soul as separate therefrom. At the end, the interlocutor asks (11653) for separate statements of what "Sāṅkhya-knowledge" and Yoga mean. Accordingly, in 11655-11673, Sāṅkhya is set forth. As long as the soul (11660) thru ignorance associates with the qualities of Prakṛti, and fails to know itself as different from them, it is not released. Such souls go to hell again and again (11672), but the Sāṅkhyas, by reasoning out this supreme reasoning, go to One-ness (*kevalatām gatāḥ*, 11673). In 11665 we have another reference to the Upaniṣadic (Brahmaistic)

²⁵ Hopkins, 135, sees in 11483a an allusion to separateness, i. e. plurality, of spirits, as a Sāṅkhya view, rejected in this passage. He translates: "That separateness of spirits [*N. B.*: there is no "of spirits" in the Sanskrit] which is part of the exposition of Sāṅkhya [*N. B.*: Hopkins omits *śruti*, which would seem to mean the Veda; is "plurality of spirits" then Vedic as well as Sāṅkhyā? and does this passage reject the Veda, as well as Sāṅkhya, as an authority? If one, then the other also] is really (explained by) the conditioned spirit when not fully enlightened by the (fully) enlightened 26th." It seems to me that "unity" and "plurality" here are used in the strictly Upaniṣadic sense described above; and that the Sāṅkhya, as well as *śruti*, is quoted as an authority, and accepted, not rejected.

doctrine of the unity underlying all empiric plurality, as in 11483 f. above.²⁶ There follows a treatment of the Yoga-method (11679-11702), preceded by the statement that "there is no knowledge (*jñāna*) like Sāṅkhya, no power (*bala*) like Yoga; both go to the same (end, *ekacaryāu*), both are declared to be deathless" (11676); only foolish men separate them, they are really one (11677); "the same which Yogas behold, that Sāṅkhyas also behold" (11678), namely, the Highest, to behold which means salvation, whether you attain it by "knowledge" or by some other method (such as Yoga). The "power" of the Yoga doubtless refers to the supernatural powers (*āśvarya*) associated with the Yoga-method; see pages 45 f. below.

I have now considered nearly all the passages which have been used to show that the epic Sāṅkhya teaches plurality of individual souls and denies a single, universal soul; and have tried to show that there is no basis for this theory. Not only is Sāṅkhya constantly associated with a belief in a World-Soul (Brahman) or God; but there is no passage, I believe, in the epic which attributes the contrary belief to it. There remains to be considered one passage, which has been interpreted as presenting the later Sāṅkhya view of independent individual souls, not only by Hopkins (123 f.), but even by Oldenberg (*Upanishaden und Buddhismus*, 1st ed., 254; 2nd ed., 219 f.), despite his general inclination to distinguish between epic and later Sāṅkhya. This is 12. 13713 ff. In 13713 the question is definitely raised: "Are there many souls (*puruṣa*), or only one, and

²⁶ Hopkins, 123, again sees a reference to "plurality of spirits" as a Sāṅkhya view. The verse 11665 reads: *avyaktāikatvam ity āhur nānātvam puruṣās tathā, sarvabhūta-dayāvantāḥ kevalam jñānam āsthitāḥ*. This seems to me to mean: "'It is (reaches) a unity in the Unmanifest (the esoteric);' so they explain the plurality (of the manifest, empiric universe),—men (*puruṣās*) who, having compassion for all beings, resort to pure knowledge." The preceding verse has just said that enlightened sages recognize "the eternal in the transitory, the unmanifest in the manifest," that is, the One in the many. The whole passage is definitely Brahmaistic. Hopkins: "Those who have the religion of compassion . . . say that there is unity in the Unmanifest but a plurality of spirits." "A plurality of spirits" would seem to me rather to require something like *puruṣanānātvam* or *nānātvam puruṣāṇām*. In any case the context seems to me clearly to indicate the interpretation offered by me.

which is the noblest soul among them, or what is declared to be the source (of them)?” The reply is: (13714) “There are many souls in the world according to the teachings of Sāṅkhya and Yoga; they do not admit that there is only one soul.” This sounds, one must grant, like a statement of later Sāṅkhya. But the passage must be considered as a whole. It goes on: (13715) “And ²⁷ as there is declared to be one source (*yonī*) of the many souls, thus I shall explain that universal (*viśvaṁ*) soul, that is above the qualities (of matter) . . . (13718) Sages, Kapila and others, taking thought on the Supreme Soul (*adhyātma*),²⁸ have composed scientific texts with rules and exceptions (i. e. in great detail). But (13719) what Vyāsa has declared in summary fashion,²⁹ namely unity of the Puruṣa(s), from that I will make a statement, by the grace of the Almighty (Vyāsa?).” This is then explained by quoting an alleged conversation between God Brahmā and Rudra, in which Rudra (repeating essentially the question of 13713) asks (13735), how is it that there are many Puruṣas, and yet a supreme One? (That there are *many* is not denied; but in a higher sense there is also One, the source and the final goal of the many, and in Him the many are after all One.) Brahmā replies: “As for the many souls of which you speak, that is quite true; (yet) it (this plurality) is to be regarded as surpassed (transcended, by a higher synthesis), and (thus) not so (i. e. ultimately not ‘many’), at the same time” (*evam etad, atikrāntaṁ draṣṭavyaṁ nāivam ity api*, 13737). “But I shall declare to you the basis (*ādhāra*) of the One Soul, how it is declared to be the source (*yonī*) of

²⁷ Hopkins in his interpretation inserts here a parenthesis: “(But this is a mere assumption)”; i. e. he takes 13715 as opposed to the doctrine mentioned in 13714. The conjunction *ca* seems rather to indicate that 13715 is felt as consistent with 13714. The view now to be set forth is (as stated in definite terms below, 13763) thoroly “Sāṅkhya and Yoga” and does not, indeed, “admit that there is *only* a universal soul”—but rather that the Universal Soul is the source of the individual souls, and that they, when perfected, return to It and are merged in It.

²⁸ This phrase is not favorable to a denial of the universal soul by Kapila.

²⁹ *saṁśatas tu*; the position of *tu* indicates that the contrast is between the summary doctrines of Vyāsa and the lengthy expositions of the others; no contrast between the doctrines themselves is intended.

the many souls (13738). So, becoming free from the qualities (of matter), they enter into that supreme, universal, greatest, eternal Soul, that is free from the qualities" (13739). This Supreme Soul cannot be seen even by Brahmā or Rudra, who are *saguṇa* (13741); He dwells bodiless in all bodies, but is not stained by the actions of the bodies (13742), remaining free, universal, and independent (13744), as He (13748) is characterized by one-ness and greatness, and He is the One Soul; He alone, the eternal, bears the epithet Great Soul (*mahā-p.*). Some call Him the Supreme Self (*paramātmā*), others the One Self, or simply the Self (*ekātmā, ātmā*; 13753). This *Paramātmā* is eternally free from the qualities; *for He is to be known as Nārāyaṇa* (Viṣṇu, God), since He is the universal-self soul (*sarvātmā puruṣo*, 13754). "He is not stained by the fruits (of action), as a lotus-petal by water. But that other (the individual soul) is characterized by action, and is associated with bondage and release" (13755).³⁰ "For (as individual soul) he is associated with the mass of the seventeen (evolvents of material nature) also; thus the soul is declared for you as manifold" (13756). The Soul is the supreme *dhāman* of the world, the conscious and the object of consciousness, the thinker and the thought, the eater and the eatable, the seer and the seen, the taster and the object of taste, and so both the subject and the object of all other senses, the "knower and the object of knowledge," the "qualitative and the free from quality" (*saguṇam nirguṇam ca!* that is, matter and soul alike! 13757-8). In other words, this is the most fundamental Upaniṣadic Brahmanism (N. B. *not* "Vedānta"! matter is not unreal). And the section ends with this verse (13763): "This I have explained fully for you in response to your question; I have described fully (the doctrine) that is *in Sāṅkhya-knowledge and in Yoga.*"

To me it seems clear that, considering this passage as a whole, we cannot understand 13714 as Hopkins and Oldenberg understand it. What Sāṅkhya and Yoga³¹ are here stated to believe

³⁰ *karmātmā tv aparo yo 'sau mokṣabandhāḥ sa yujyate*. Deussen: "Aber als Werkbehafteter ist er ein anderer, der Erlösung und Bindung unterworfen." I believe, with Deussen, that the passage understands the individual soul as ultimately and really identical with the universal.

³¹ Note that Yoga too is represented as holding the same view as

is that there are, indeed, many individual souls, empirically speaking; but that these are all emanations of, and shall (when perfected) return to, One Universal Soul, which is Everything that is. This is made quite clear in 13737, which must be understood as a commentary on 13714. To take 13714 out of its context is unjustifiable; all the more if, as I have tried to show, not a single other recorded passage in the epic is consistent with the denial of the World Soul in Sāṅkhya. Compare 12. 8764, below, page 31.

Sāṅkhya associated with Quietism or Asceticism.

We saw above (pages 3 f.) that in the Bhagavad Gītā Sāṅkhya is not only the "way of knowledge," but is also assumed to imply renunciation of actions—quietism. The stock argument for quietism is that all acts cause further existence, by the law of karma; therefore one should, so far as possible, cease to act. There is however no necessary, inherent connexion between quietism and the "way of knowledge"; and we are not compelled to suppose that Sāṅkhya was invariably understood in this way. Yet, if pure knowledge is to be our means of salvation, it is natural enough to advise an inactive life, given up to meditation, in pursuit of that knowledge. At any rate we find various epic passages, besides those in the Gītā, in which quietism is associated with Sāṅkhya. So the famous Pañcaśikha section, 12. 7886 ff., which is identified as a statement of the way of salvation according to Sāṅkhya (7900). The speaker first deals with certain heretics: the materialists (*nāstika*, 7908), whose view that there is no soul or "self" apart from the body is stated in 7903-9 and refuted in 7910-11; then some unnamed others (Nīlakaṇṭha says, probably rightly, that Buddhists are meant), whose opinion is that rebirth is determined by karma and that this is based on ignorance, but that there is no soul (7912-4), and who are refuted in 7915 ff. But not content with

Sāṅkhya. This is passed over in silence by Hopkins and Oldenberg, but it seems to me that it should have caused them some misgivings. Either the attribution of these doctrines to Yoga is meaningless verbiage (in which case the same may be just as true of Sāṅkhya); or else H. and O., on their hypothesis, must assume that a denial of a supreme soul is attributed to Yoga, which is inconsistent even with the *later* Yoga, a theistic system.

On the other hand, the Sāṅkhya method has no monopoly of *vāirāgya* or *sannyāsa*. The two are by no means universally associated. And it seems clear that the association, when it occurs, is distinctly incidental, and does not concern the fundamental or primary meaning of Sāṅkhya.

Relation of epic Brahmaism to later Sāṅkhya and Vedānta.

It appears, then, that Sāṅkhya means in the Upaniṣads and the Epic simply the way of salvation by knowledge, and does not imply any system of metaphysical truth whatever. In so far as its adherents tend to agree on certain metaphysical beliefs, namely a sort of developed form of Upaniṣadic Brahmaism, this simply means that all orthodox Hindus of the day tended to accept those beliefs. The chief development within this Brahmaism, as compared with the earlier Upaniṣads, consisted in an increasing attention paid to the constituent elements and the evolution of Material Nature, the non-soul, which in the earlier Upaniṣads had been rather ignored, not because its existence was denied, but because it did not interest the earlier thinkers, who were absorbed in the contemplation of the One Ultimate Reality, which they identified with the Soul. The epic thinkers too, tho they discussed Matter more than their predecessors, did so merely to emphasize its unimportance, its worthlessness. To them also the Soul was all that really counted. And the Soul was still ultimately One—was Brahman, or God. To be sure, in exoteric, empiric, worldly existence there are many souls; but it is only in its finite, “perishable” (*kṣara*, e. g. 12. 8764) form that the soul is plural. And this plurality lasts only until enlightenment is reached. The enlightened soul realizes its unity with the One that is All; for him there is no longer any plurality. This is not “Sāṅkhya” doctrine alone; it is accepted by *all* orthodox schools, as we have repeatedly seen. In fact, to speak of “schools” in this connexion is to run the risk of misleading; if we exclude heretics like the Buddhists and the materialists, we hear of essential differences of opinion only as to the best method of reaching salvation. And, by the by, each of the methodological “schools” generally recognizes the validity of the methods advocated by the others. The Sāṅkhya has, however, a sort of special interest in this Ultimate Truth,

because it is in knowledge of that Truth that Sāṅkhya finds the best way of salvation.

None of the specially characteristic points of doctrine of the later, classical systems of philosophy are found in this somewhat vague and indefinite body of ideas which we may call Epic Brahmaism.³³ And yet we can see clearly the starting-points of all the later systems: particularly of the later Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. In the epic, Material Nature is real, and distinct from the (individual) souls; the individual souls have a qualified, finite reality, but when emancipated realize their ultimate identity with the One (World-Soul or God); that One is, again, regularly conceived as in some sort of relation to Material Nature, say as its "overseer," so that Material Nature, tho real, is only to a qualified extent independent (it is for instance often thought of as the "body" of the World-Soul, His "lower" or "material nature").³⁴ It remained for the Vedānta school of Śaṅkara to carry out to the bitter end the doctrine that there is really only One, namely Brahman, and—with relentless logic—to deduce from this not only the unreality of plural existence of individual souls (the epic comes fairly close to this, without quite reaching it), but also the unreality of all matter (which can be read into the epic only by serious distortions). Much earlier than Śaṅkara, and apparently much earlier than the doctrine of *māyā* as he taught it, is the classical system of the Sāṅkhya Kārikās. This system developed equally clearly out of epic Brahmaism, but in a wholly different direction. It took as its starting-point the doctrine of the absolute independence of the individual souls on the one hand and material nature on the other. It emphasized the contrast between these two principles, and dwelt on the evolution of material nature,³⁵ as set over against the unchanging nature of the soul. Above all it got rid of the World-Soul (Brahman, or God) altogether; a

³³ On this I agree emphatically with Dahlmann, *Sāṅkhya-Philosophie*, p. xvi f.

³⁴ It is sometimes even said definitely that Material Nature springs from the World-Soul (e. g. 12. 13035). This subject will be treated more fully and adequately in my forthcoming book on the Bhagavad Gītā (Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1924).

³⁵ Keeping very close in details to older accounts found in the epic; cf. Dahlmann, *op. cit.*, p. 1 ff.

radical step for which, as I have tried to prove, there is no authority in the epic period.

The retention of the name "Sāṅkhya" by the adherents of this later system is easy to understand, and from their point of view seems entirely justifiable. They too were seeking a means of salvation, not simply the abstract truth as an end in itself (cf. the first paragraph of this article). They taught salvation by knowledge; knowledge of the ultimate truth, namely, the truth of the absolute independence of the soul from material nature. Their method was, then, precisely the method of the epic "Sāṅkhya." The metaphysical content of their doctrines was based upon a *part*—an important part—of the content of epic Brahmaism, which had been familiarly accepted by the followers of epic "Sāṅkhya," as well as by the other orthodox methodological schools of epic times. In so far as it differed from that, such differences did not in any way concern the use of the name Sāṅkhya, which applied not to metaphysical content, but to method. From the point of view of early times, the name Sāṅkhya might just as well be applied to Śankara's "Vedānta" as to the Sāṅkhya of the Kārikās; for Śankara, too, taught salvation by knowledge of the truth, and his "truth" was also based on (or developed out of) epic Brahmaism, altho his formulation was quite different from that of the Kārikās. That Śankara did not claim the name Sāṅkhya is doubtless due to the fact that long before his time the name had become associated with the classical system of the Kārikās, which taught metaphysical doctrines to which he was radically opposed. It was only after the formulation of the system of the Kārikās, and precisely as a result thereof, that the name Sāṅkhya came to be associated exclusively with the doctrines of plurality of souls and no world-soul.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that both the later Sāṅkhya and the later Vedānta, by their respective changes in the older Brahmaism, have introduced what must be clearly recognized as logical improvements, altho perhaps at the expense of "common sense." The epic speculations, like those of the Upaniṣads which they so closely resemble, are unsystematic. It is easy to find logical flaws in them. Matter is eternal and independent, yet somehow dependent on the One Supreme Soul; the individual souls are many, and yet there is in the last analysis but

One Soul; and so on. At least the most glaring of these logical inconsistencies are removed in the later systematic philosophies, by various means. They are thus made to appeal more to the closet philosopher. Yet one cannot help questioning whether their carefully built houses of cards (which after all break down at one point or another—I suppose like all philosophic systems, east or west!) do not lose in freshness, simplicity, earnestness, and vigor more than they gain in refinement and subtlety.

Literal meaning of the word “Sāṅkhya.”

If I am right as to what “Sāṅkhya” was originally applied to, it is evident that the dispute as to the literal meaning of the word is settled. It cannot possibly mean “(the metaphysical system) characterized by numbers or enumeration, (the) numerical (system),”—alleged to have been applied to the (later) Sāṅkhya system because of its many numerical categories. In spite of the authority of Garbe,³⁶ Hopkins,³⁷ Oldenberg,³⁸ and Winternitz,³⁹ this view seems to me *a priori* improbable, even from the standpoint of the later Sāṅkhya system. Are numerical categories more strikingly characteristic even of that later system than of other Hindu systems? I doubt it. All Hindu systems, of science and pseudo-science as well as philosophy, love numerical categories and revel in them. Can any Hindu systematic treatise on any subject be imagined that does not abound in numerical categories?⁴⁰ With what less “numerical” system would Sāṅkhya be contrasted in this sense? It is commonly set off against Yoga in particular. Yet the later Yoga system, so far from lacking numerical categories, takes over practically all the categories of the Sāṅkhya system and even

³⁶ Garbe is the originator of this interpretation, and still defends it in *Sāṅkhya Philosophie*², 189 f.

³⁷ Page 127.

³⁸ *Lehre der Upanishaden und Anfänge des Buddhismus*¹, page 208 (2^d page 179).

³⁹ *Gesch. d. ind. Lit.*, 3, page 448, note 2. Jacobi also (*GGA* 1919, 28 f.) thinks that Sāṅkhya means “dealing with enumeration,” tho in a different sense, which I cannot take space to discuss here. Formerly (*GGA* 1895, 209) Jacobi accepted the view which I express below.

⁴⁰ Jacobi (*GGA* 1895, 209) remarks very truly that Jainism, Buddhism, and other sects of the time go much farther than Sāṅkhya in devotion to numbered categories.

adds to them. Where is the point, then, in calling Sāṅkhya the "numerical system"?

But of course the conclusive reply to this interpretation, in my opinion, is that Sāṅkhya did not originally mean *any* system of philosophy, numerical or other, but simply and solely a way of gaining salvation, namely by knowledge. If this is so, of course the word can only mean what all authorities before Garbe⁴¹ took it to mean—"dealing with speculation, calculation" in the sense of reasoning, philosophy. Sāṅkhya is the philosophical, reflective, speculative, intellectual *method*. That is why it is called, for instance in the Gītā, *jñāna-yoga*, "way or discipline of knowledge." It implied in itself nothing as to what truth is, but only an adherence to the intellectual method, a hope for salvation thru knowledge of the truth alone, rather than thru some other means, such as performance of actions or devotion to God. It seems to be universally admitted that the word and its cognates (the nouns *saṁkhyā* and [*pari*-]*saṁkhyāna*, the verb [*pari*-]*saṁkhyā*) have such meanings in the epic and other early literature. Even Garbe grants this (*op. cit.* 189 f.), tho he considers it a "transferred" use of the words. E. g. in Yājñ. Dh. Ś. 3. 158 *śarīraparisaṁkhyāna* means "reflection about the body." In Mbh. 12. 11934 *saṁkhyā* (and its synonym *sāṅkhya*, three verses before) is not a philosophical term at all but one of the five "qualities of speech," and a precise definition is given of it:

doṣāṇām ca guṇāṇām ca pramāṇam pravibhāgataḥ
kaṁcid artham abhipretya sā saṁkhyety upadhāryatām.

"The weighing of strong and weak points severally, as one presses forward to some conclusion, this should be understood as *saṁkhyā* (or, three verses before, *sāṅkhya*), reasoning, calculation." (Hopkins, 95, "reckoning".) As an adjective, *sāṅkhya* would then seem to mean "(the method of salvation)

⁴¹ For references to early expressions of this view see Garbe, *op. cit.*, 189 note 2. For Hindu authorities holding the same view see Fitz Edward Hall, *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya*, Preface, page 4, note. Cf. Amara I. 1, 4, 11 *carcā saṁkhyā vicāraṇā*; Śāśvata 538 *ekatvādaṁ vicāraṇe saṁkhyā*. Since, and in spite of, Garbe's interpretation the older view has been maintained by Deussen, *Allgem. Gesch. d. Phil.*, I. 3, page 15, and Charpentier, *ZDMG* 65. 847.

based on reckoning or calculation" in the sense of the weighing of arguments, reflective reasoning. It was originally the *only* method which claimed a rationalistic, an intellectual, basis. Of course it is not necessary to deny the possibility that the word and its relatives may occasionally be used with conscious and semi-punning allusion to the meaning "number,"⁴² which is unquestionably one of the early meanings of the word *saṁkhyā*. A Hindu would not be a Hindu if he did not play on various meanings of a word, when he gets the chance. But if I interpret correctly the evidence adduced above, the original meaning cannot possibly be "dealing with numbers or numerical categories," even if that interpretation were otherwise a natural one, which it seems to me it is not.

The early meaning of Yoga.

We have arrived at a quite clear and sharp definition of the term *Sāṁkhya*. Can we hope to do as well with the complementary term *Yoga*?⁴³

As all Sanskritists know, the word *yoga* is a very fluid one, used in a great variety of senses, philosophical and other. It may mean simply "method, means"; and it is used in that sense in many philosophic passages of the epic, notably in the *Gītā* 3. 3, quoted at the beginning of this article (cf. also page 4). Here the adherents of *Sāṁkhya* follow the *yoga* (method, discipline) of knowledge, while the adherents of *Yoga* follow the *yoga* of action. Obviously two entirely different meanings are given to the word *yoga* in this one verse. Another meaning is "exertion, diligence, zeal"; used especially to describe a regular, disciplined course of procedure leading to a definite end (in the *Gītā* and other philosophic passages, ordinarily to the end of emancipation). In this sense it is quite natural that it

⁴² It seems to me to be so used at 12. 11410, to which Garbe refers (*l. c.*) as proof for his theory of the meaning of the word. I am unable to see why Garbe refers also to 12. 11393, 11409 and 11673 for further proof. These verses seem to me to contain no allusion, even punningly, to the "number" idea. In fact it is surprising how seldom we find this word-play, considering the Hindu propensity for punning. If Garbe were right we should expect to find it constantly recurring.

⁴³ On *Yoga* in the epic see especially Hopkins, "Yoga-technique in the Great Epic," *JAOS* 22. 333-379 (in addition to his essay in *The Great Epic*).

should have been applied to a system of restraint of the senses and other more or less ascetic practices (later including breath-exercises), conceived as leading either to emancipation or to some supernatural attainment; in popular usage, to any magic power. In the *Gītā*, however (to which we shall for the moment limit our consideration), it ordinarily designates no such system as this, but rather a very different course of procedure, namely the method of salvation characterized by participation in action without interest in the fruits of action. Hence the fuller expression *karma-yoga*, which as we saw from 3. 3 is synonymous with Yoga alone in this connexion. Worldly action is meant; it is particularly exemplified by the duty to fight enjoined upon Arjuna. Fighting is surely far enough from restraint of senses or breath-exercises. Action characterized by indifference is the central principle of the *Gītā*'s Yoga; but the "action" feature is just as important as the "indifference" feature. The word *yoga* definitely implies *activity* as used in the *Gītā*, where it is constantly colored by association (perhaps more or less subconscious) with the other meaning of the word, "energetic performance, exertion." It is thus opposed to the system or "discipline" of the Sāṅkhya, namely the *jñāna-yoga* (the use of the same word *yoga* is confusing) or "way" or "discipline" of knowledge, with definite implication in the *Gītā* (and in some other places, see pages 29 ff.) of *sannyāsa*, abandonment of action.

We shall see presently that other parts of the epic understand Yoga as something quite different from this "disciplined (but worldly) activity," and something more suggestive of its later, classical meaning. We shall speak of them presently. In every case, however, Yoga is—like Sāṅkhya—not a "system" of belief or of metaphysics. It is always a way, a method, of getting something, usually salvation (tho sometimes, especially in more popular usage, a lower goal is aimed at). And it seems to me that the common denominator of all the epic definitions of Yoga is *disciplined activity, earnest striving*—by *active* (not rationalistic or intellectual) means. It is distinctly not "union."⁴⁴ In English we may describe the *goal* of Yoga (or

⁴⁴ That *yoga* does not mean "union" in philosophic language in the Mbh. and contemporary texts is a conclusion which I reached inde-

of Sāṅkhya either) as "union" (with Brahman or God). But it is a striking fact that the word *yoga* and its cognates are *not* ordinarily used of this. Instead, the emancipated soul "goes to" (*adhi-gam*), "attains" (*āp*, *prāp*), or "sees" (*paś*) Brahman; or if he is said to attain "oneness, sameness" with Brahman, the word used is not *yoga* but e. g. *sāmyatā* (12. 8789 *gacched akṣarasāmyatām*). Cf. Hopkins, *JAOS* 22. 334: "The union-idea of the author of the Muṇḍaka [Upaniṣad] is expressed not by *yoga* but by *sāmya*"; an acute observation, which, it seems to me, applies equally well to the epic. *Yoga* is not the goal but a method of reaching it. As distinguished from Sāṅkhya, the method of knowledge, it means the active method, the method of exertion. Sāṅkhya seeks salvation by *knowing* something; *Yoga* by *doing* something.

pendently from my study of the texts themselves. Subsequently I was pleased to find that according to excellent authority the word does not mean this even later. Charpentier, *ZDMG* 65. 846 f., says: "Dass das Wort nicht, wie die populäre Auffassung es wollte, 'Verbindung' (der Seele mit Īśvara) bedeutet, ist klar und wird ja in Sarvadarś. S. 129 abgewiesen." So also, according to Charpentier, Tuxen in his book on *Yoga* (Copenhagen, 1911; I regret that I have no access to this highly praised work). Tuxen follows the late commentator Vyāsa in defining *yoga* as equivalent to *samādhi*. Charpentier however suggests that it "eigentlich von der Bedeutung 'Anstrengung' ausgehend, das ganze 'praktische' Treiben bezeichnet und am ehesten etwa mit 'Praxis' zu übersetzen wäre. Denn der praktische Teil ist es doch, der für das System bezeichnend ist—das Theoretische gehört dem Sāṅkhya." I am glad to find myself in perfect agreement with Charpentier as to the meaning of the word *yoga*. I should also accept his second sentence as far as concerns the classical *Yoga* "system." It would apply approximately to the early *Yoga* of the epic, if we understand by "System" not a system of metaphysical truth, but a method of salvation.—Dahlmann (*Sāṅkhya-Philosophie*, *passim*) came near the truth in many ways with his theory that epic Sāṅkhya and *Yoga* are two parts of the same philosophical system, one the theoretical part, the other the practical. But he, like virtually all others, made the fundamental error of interpreting the terms as names for a systematic philosophy. It seems to me that he exaggerates somewhat the unity and systematization of the philosophic speculations in the epic; but I dissent much more emphatically from his view that Sāṅkhya (or "Sāṅkhya-Yoga") is a name for the "system" (if we can call it that) of epic Brahmaism, or for any system of metaphysical truth. "Die Sāṅkhya-Philosophie," as applied to the epic, is itself a misnomer, as I hope to have shown.

Yoga in the Mokṣadharmā section.

In the Mokṣadharmā section of Mbh. 12 we have several descriptions of Yoga, usually contrasted with Sāṅkhya. They agree with each other in all essentials. In most of them knowledge, the *Leitmotif* of the Sāṅkhya passages described above, is conspicuously absent. Once or twice it is mentioned in passing, in rigmarole lists of virtues or general desiderata, evidently without any deeper significance. In addition to 12. 7129-50, 8769-8803, 11373-92, I would call attention especially to 12. 11679-11702, one of the best and clearest statements. It follows a description of Sāṅkhya (11655-73), called "Sāṅkhya-knowledge" and contrasted with "Yoga-power" (11675 f.) or "Yoga-activity" (*yoga-kṛtyam*, 11682; a very significant expression, used, as Hopkins says, *JAOS* 22. 341, "not infrequently" in the epic for Yoga-practice). This Yoga-activity is two-fold (11682): *saguṇa*, "qualified" (provided with the qualities, *guṇas*; one might almost translate "material"), and *nirguṇa*, "unqualified, qualityless" (free from the *guṇas*, or, as it were, "super-material"; perhaps "exoteric" and "esoteric" would approximately represent the two terms).

11683 *dhāraṇam cāiva manasaḥ prāṇāyāmaś ca pārthiva
ekāgratā ca manasaḥ prāṇāyāmas tathāiva ca.*⁴⁵

11684 *prāṇāyāmo hi saguṇo nirguṇam dhārayen manah.*

"(The two stages are:) fixation of the mind, and restraint of the vital powers ('breaths'); concentration of the mind, and restraint of the vital powers. For restraint of the vital powers

⁴⁵ This verse seems to have always been misunderstood. The commentator, followed by P. C. Roy and Hopkins (*JAOS* 22. 341), understands *ab* as referring to the *saguṇa* stage, *cd* to the *nirguṇa* stage, *prāṇāyāma* being common to both. But the following 11684b distinctly indicates that *dhāraṇam manasaḥ* is *nirguṇa*, not *saguṇa*; and 11684a even more distinctly states that *prāṇāyāma* is *saguṇa* alone, not *nirguṇa*. This is confirmed by 11375 (page 41). Deussen refers the whole of 11683 to the *saguṇa* stage, which is shown to be impossible by 11375 (*ekāgratā manasaḥ* there is *nirguṇa*) as well as by 11684b. Since 11684b *nirguṇam dhārayen manah* obviously refers to the stage just described as *dhāraṇam manasaḥ*, this latter can only be the *nirguṇa* stage; and it is therefore a synonym of *ekāgratā manasaḥ*, which is also *nirguṇa* according to 11375. It seems to me evident that 11683ab is repeated, in partly identical, partly varying, language, in 11683cd.

is qualified ('material, exoteric,' the lower stage). One should fix (concentrate) the mind, (making it) free from qualities." Compare with this 12. 11375, where we also find "the supreme power" of the Yogas (described as *dhyāna*, meditation) consisting of two stages, *prāṇāyāma* and *ekāgratā manasaḥ*, of which the former is *saguṇa*, the latter *nirguṇa*. The *prāṇas* are not what we mean by "breath" but, in accordance with standard Upaniṣadic usage, the "vital powers" or functions of the human organism; specifically and particularly the senses.⁴⁶ The first or lower stage in the "disciplined activity" of Yoga, according to this definition, is control or restraint of the senses, bringing them to rest "in the mind (*manas*)," cf. 11689, 11377, 11381. But this stage is still "be-qualified," *saguṇa*;⁴⁷ in order to attain the higher, *nirguṇa*, "qualityless" stage one must now concentrate the mind (*dhārayen manasaḥ*, 11684; cf. *ekāgraṁ dhārayen manasaḥ*, 7133; the noun is *dhāraṇam manasaḥ*, 11683, or *ekāgratā manasaḥ*, 11683, 11375), namely, in the *ahamkāra* (11689); then the *ahamkāra* must be fixed in the *buddhi*, and that in the primal Material Nature, *prakṛti* (11690). Or, more briefly, the process may be described simply as sinking the *manas* in the *buddhi* (11381) or in the self, *ātman* (8784), without mention of the *ahamkāra* or the primal *prakṛti* (yet the latter seems to be understood in 11381, for just below, in 11384, the adept is "returned into *prakṛti*," *prakṛtim āpannam*). In any case, when the final stage is reached, all the faculties have come to rest, and one sits like a stick of wood (7133, 11382) or a stone (11694) or a lamp burning in a wind-

⁴⁶ Nothing is said in any of these passages on Yoga about literal "restraint of breath," as practised by later yogins. On the contrary, the explanation of *prāṇāyāma* (as the first or *saguṇa* stage of Yoga [11683 f., 11375]) is clearly given in 11687 ff. and 11377 ff. respectively: viz., subduing of the *senses*. Of course, according to early Hindu theory, the vital functions or powers are "carried" by the "breaths" in the body; that is why the name *prāṇa* was given to the vital powers, as it constantly is in the very earliest Upaniṣads.

⁴⁷ Cf. 7139, in another description of Yoga; after the external senses have been brought to a complete rest, so that one no longer hears, feels, sees, tastes, or smells (7134 f.), which is the "first stage of meditation," then the "sixth" (inner) sense, i. e. the *manas*, "still stirs." Therefore, one must now proceed to reduce it also, the *manas*, to complete cessation (7142).

less place (11693, 11385). Then he does absolutely nothing but meditate (*dhyā*) on the "eternal Lord and the imperishable Brahman" (11691) and finally succeeds in beholding (*anu-paś*) Him (11386), in reaching equality (*sāmyatā*) with Him (8789). This is, of course, salvation.

The details of this scheme vary, to be sure. I have called attention in passing to some of the variants; it is hardly possible here to go into the matter further. For my present purpose the variations are unimportant.⁴⁸ They are just what we should expect in this period, when there are as yet no cut-and-dried systems, only somewhat vague tendencies. But the central idea of the method of salvation known here as Yoga comes out, after all, quite clearly and definitely. It consists in a course of what we may call, for short, self-hypnosis: a gradual numbing of the senses, beginning with the external ones and then passing to the internal organs, and culminating in a state of trance, in which the adept attains an immediate vision of the One,⁴⁹ and feels himself united with Him.

Superficially it might seem that the self-hypnotizing (if I may use that conveniently brief term) Yogin resembles a quietistic follower of Sāṅkhya (see pages 29 ff. above). But their methods are really absolutely different in principle. The Sāṅkhya quietist is simply doing nothing, because he thinks any form of activity is evil. (Cf. page 3, note 6.) He hopes for salvation thru knowledge alone, which to him implies cessation of all action. The Yogin of the Mokṣadharmas sections has little interest in mere knowledge as such. He is intent on a very definite, quasi-mechanistic course of "disciplined action, effort," which is to bring him to salvation directly. His "action," to be sure, is not normal, worldly action. It involves control and gradual repression of the bodily powers. But this

⁴⁸ I pass over also some details which are presented with a reasonable approach to uniformity, but which do not seem important for my present theme, such as the five "hindrances to Yoga" (treated by Hopkins, *JAOS* 22. 339). On the "powers" (*aiśvarya*) see below, pages 45 f.

⁴⁹ This, I believe, is precisely what *pratyakṣa hetavo* means in 12. 11043 (see above, page 9). The Yogas are there said to rely on "immediate perception" (of the Supreme), the Sāṅkhyas on "teaching," knowledge (*śāstra*).

is itself conceived as an active process; it is not a mere passive abstention from action. Without ever having tried it, one may venture the guess that it would indeed be a quite "strenuous" undertaking, involving a good deal of zealous application and "disciplined activity"!

Two different interpretations of Yoga method.

Now, a critic will say, all this is far enough from the disciplined and unselfish, *but normal*, activity (exemplified by fighting) which we found to be the usual definition of Yoga in the Gītā. Yes: but nevertheless it is a way of seeking salvation by a process of activity, by doing something, by "Praxis" (as Charpentier puts it, see note 44, page 39), by practice, by exertion. It fits the definition "disciplined activity" perfectly well. And that is clearly the way in which the term Yoga is understood in this connexion, as indicated by the word (*yoga-*) *kṛtya* (or, elsewhere, as in the Gītā, *karma*; cf. below, page 44), "Yoga-action," as distinguished from "Sāṅkhya-knowledge." Instead of seeking salvation by merely attaining knowledge of the supreme truth, which is expected to bring salvation immediately (as Sāṅkhya teaches), the followers of Yoga seek salvation by a regular, disciplined, zealous course of *action*. Yoga is not concerned with any metaphysical theorizing. It leaves that to Sāṅkhya, to which theorizing is necessarily important (page 21). Yoga does not deny the "truth" asserted by Sāṅkhya; we are even told at times that it accepts it. But its method of salvation lies not thru mere cognition of that truth, but thru a course of active discipline.

The subsumption under the name Yoga of these two different programs of "disciplined activity" is signalized by the fact that even in the Bhagavad Gītā, which ordinarily understands by Yoga the disinterested performance of worldly acts, the other interpretation is not unknown. And the Gītā shows no sign that it is conscious of any inconsistency between the two programs.⁵⁰ In its sixth chapter it gives us a description of the

⁵⁰ That is, at this point. In another passage, 13. 24 (quoted by me page 18), the Gītā seems to make a clear distinction between *dhyāna* (which, apparently, can only mean "self-hypnotism," cf. Mbh. 12. 11374, page 41 above) and Sāṅkhya and "*karma-yoga*" as methods of salvation.

Yogin which, while much less technical than those quoted above from the Mokṣadharmā, decidedly suggests their methods of *dhyāna*, *prāṇāyāma*, and *dhāraṇam manasaḥ*.⁵¹

On the other hand, the Mokṣadharmā section, tho it knows also the Gītā's method of salvation by disinterested but worldly activity, does not seem to apply the name Yoga to it. Quite the contrary: in one passage at least it definitely distinguishes this method from both Yoga and Sāṅkhya. I refer to the conversation between King Janaka and Sulabhā, 12. 11871 ff. Janaka says he has studied under Pañcaśikha, who (tho called specifically a Sāṅkhya teacher in 11878) knows and has taught to Janaka *three* ways of salvation, viz., "Sāṅkhya-knowledge" (*sāṅkhya-jñāna*), Yoga, and the "Royal Method, method for kings" (*mahīpālavidhi*; 11876). These are explained in 11889 ff. "For a threefold foundation (*trividhā niṣṭhā*, cf. Bh. G. 3. 3) in regard to salvation (*mokṣe*) has been recognized by various supreme knowers of salvation. Transcendental knowledge and complete abandonment of actions (*jñānam lokottaram yac ca sarvatyāgaś ca karmaṇām*) is expounded by some knowers of the science of salvation as the knowledge-basis (knowledge-method, i. e. of salvation, *jñānaniṣṭhā*; this, of course, is the Sāṅkhya method). Likewise other sages of subtle insight proclaim the action-basis (action-method, *karmaniṣṭhā*; the Yoga method). Abandoning both of these alike, knowledge and mere action, this third basis (of salvation) has been expounded by that noble teacher (*prahāyobhayam apy evaṁ jñānam karma ca*

⁵¹ See Bh. G. 6. 10-26. Note especially 11-12: *śucāu deśe* (cf. 12. 8792, 8795) *pratiṣṭhāpya sthiram āsanam ātmanah . . . tattrāikāgram manah kṛtvā* (cf. *ekāgratā manasaḥ*, pp. 40 f.) *yatacittendriyakriyāḥ, upaviśy-āsane yuñjyād yogam ātmaviśuddhaye*.—In 19 occurs the comparison of the Yogin to a lamp burning in a windless place, as above, p. 41. Again, 24: *manasādivendriyagrāmam viniyamya samantataḥ*, (25) *śanāiḥ-śanāir upamed buddhyā dhṛtigrhitayā, ātmasamsthām manah kṛtvā na kiṁcid api cintayet*. The last phrase would hardly be used in the Mokṣadharmā sections at all; instead of "thinking on nothing at all" he should "think on the Supreme Soul." The Gītā's expression is semi-popular (one is tempted to call it, in slang, a "give-away"; at least one fears that the activities of some of the "adepts" who were ostensibly thinking on the Supreme Soul may have been more accurately, if less courteously, characterized by the Gītā's expression). Rigid, logical consistency is, however, not to be expected here.

kevalam, tṛtiye 'yaṁ samākhyātā niṣṭhā tena mahātmanā, 11891)." The "third method," opposed to both Sāṅkhya (method of knowledge with abandonment of all action) and Yoga (method of disciplined activity, here clearly, as always in the Mokṣadharmā, in the sense of "self-hypnosis," *prāṇāyāma* and *dhāraṇam manasaḥ*), is of course the *mahīpālavidhi*, "method of (for) kings," referred to in 11876. In the following verses Janaka, who prefers it to the others, explains it at length. It agrees perfectly with the Gītā's usual definition of Yoga, viz., remaining in the world (specifically in the life of a prince, just as in Arjuna's case), and performing all acts required by the traditional duties of the station to which one is born, but with indifference to results. The same arguments are used that are found in the Gītā.—In the sequel Janaka's arguments for this method are refuted by Sulabhā, who declares that it is impossible for a king to be saved while keeping his kingdom. She demands renunciation in *deeds* as well as in thoughts. This makes me rather inclined to suspect that the passage is a definite polemic against the Bhagavad Gītā—as it certainly is a polemic against one of its cardinal doctrines. Our passage (which in 11889 has what looks suspiciously like an echo of Bh. G. 3. 3) says point-blank: the claim that the Yoga method may be interpreted as disinterested activity while remaining in worldly life, is false. This is not true Yoga, but a different method, and an unsound one; those who hope for salvation thru it are deluded.

There is, in any case, no doubt of the fact that the Gītā's interpretation of Yoga (tho etymologically it fits the word admirably) was not the usual one, either in epic times or later. It is obvious that the later, classical system of the Yoga-sūtras is based upon the method of salvation described in the Mokṣadharmā sections. And the use of the words *yoga* and *yogin* in popular language in the epic itself (see Hopkins's study in *JAOS* 22, *passim*), referring to the possession of various supernatural or magic powers, shows that this interpretation was commoner in early times as well. For the supernatural powers (*aiśvarya*) connected with Yoga are, of course, only to be associated with self-hypnotism, trances, and the like; not with the life of a prince or warrior, even tho he be a dutiful and unselfish one. Even in the Mokṣadharmā section (12. 11062) we are told

that "the Yoga (masculine, = *yogin*), attaining power (*bala*, cf. 12. 11676, "there is no knowledge like Sāṅkhya, no power like Yoga"), may assume many thousands of selves (*ātmans*, i. e., may make himself thousandfold) and roam about the earth in all these guises"; in the following verses it is said that in one form he can enjoy the objects of sense, while simultaneously in another form he can perform the severest penance, etc. However, the author of this same passage regards such powers as comparatively trivial. In 11065, after disposing of these "powers," he says he will now explain the subtle (*sūkṣma*), i. e. superior, powers of the Yogin. This he does in 11066 ff.; they consist simply in the power of attaining salvation, or the highest goal. In fact, other passages definitely deprecate any interest in the supernatural powers. Cf. 12. 8685 f.: "Understand (now, after the Sāṅkhya method has been described) how and by what means men reach salvation thru Yoga. He who, having transcended the supernatural powers of Yoga, ceases (from worldly or sensory activities), is released (*yogāīśvaryam atikrānto yo niṣkrāmati mucyate*)." And, more clearly, 12. 7180: "The reciter who takes delight in undertakings to gain supernatural powers (*athāīśvaryapravṛtteṣu jāpakas tatra rajyate*), that very thing means hell for him. By that means he does not gain emancipation (*sa eva nirayas tasya nāsāu tasmāt pramucyate*)." The supernatural powers are at best trivial and incidental acquisitions on the way to the supreme goal. But naturally in the popular consciousness they loomed large, and were responsible for many a degradation of the Yoga method, not only in later times, but even in the time of the epic.

I cannot here take up more at length the question of certain other "methods of salvation" which are mentioned in the epic, such as ritualism, asceticism (*tapas*), and devotion to God (*bhakti*). They are sometimes clearly distinguished from both the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga methods, sometimes more or less blended with one of them (usually Yoga, since the definition of Yoga is, as we have seen, elastic enough to include any program that can be regarded as a course of *action*). Compare Bhagavad Gītā 6. 46 f. and 13. 24 f. (pages 5 and 18 above).

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
PHILADELPHIA.

II.—PHILOLOGICAL STUDIES.¹

1. Ambrosian Mangers.

In the Iliad (8, 434) we read that Hera's steeds were tied by the Horæ to ambrosian mangers, *i. e.* mangers full of sweet herbs (not fragrant hay; *cf.* DB 2, 312; Xen. *Anab.* 1, 5, 10; 4, 5, 33; Ov. *Met.* 6, 457).² Green forage is the natural food of horses. Ambrosia, which denoted originally the fragrant steam arising from the fat of the sacrifices (*Il.* 1, 317; 8, 549; 2, 423; *cf.* AJP 43, 246) and was afterwards used for *scented unguent*, perfume, denotes also *sweet herb* (Plin. 27, 28) just as Gr. *ároma* is used in this sense (Xen. *Anab.* 1, 5, 1). The scent of new-mown hay is due to coumarin; it is found *e. g.* in vernal grass, *anthoxanthum odoratum*, especially at flowering time, also in woodruff, *asperula odorata*, which is used to flavor the German may-drink. This punch is mentioned as early as 854 by a Benedictine monk of the monastery of Prüm in the district of Treves, where Charlemagne's grandson, Lothair I, died in 855. His remains were found there in 1860. *Lorraine* < *Lotharingia* < *Lotharii regnum* represents the inheritance of Lothair I's second son, Lothair II.

When Iris had taken Aphrodite, who had been wounded by Diomedes, to the Olympus, in Ares' chariot, she unharnessed the horses and cast before them ambrosian food (*Il.* 5, 369; *cf.* 13, 35) *i. e.* sweet-scented grasses. If it had been the food of the gods, imparting immortality, the poet would not have used the verb which is employed in the NT passages *Cast not your pearls before swine* and *It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs* (Matt. 7, 6; 15, 26).

When Hera came to the former confluence of the Simois and Scamander near Troy (*cf.* Bædeker, *Konstantinopel und das westliche Kleinasien*, p. 176) the steeds of her chariot ate the

¹ The following nine brief communications are abstracts of papers presented at the monthly meetings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association during the academic session 1922/3; Nos. 3 and 4 were presented on Dec. 21, and the others on Oct. 19, Nov. 16, Jan. 18, Feb. 15, Mar. 15, Ap. 19, May 17, respectively.

² For the abbreviations see vol. 43 of this JOURNAL, p. 238, note 2.

ambrosia which the Simois had caused to sprout for them (*Il.* 5, 777).³ This means simply that the horses grazed (note *νέμεσθαι*) on the fragrant meadows watered by the Simois.⁴ Sweet-smelling forage-plants are still plentiful about the streams of the Trojan plain (EB¹¹ 27, 315^a).

When the Scamander bids the Simois join him in overwhelming Achilles with his flood, Hephæstus checked the two streams with his fire, so that the sweet-smelling marsh-plants were burning (*Il.* 21, 307): *λωτός* (cf. *Il.* 2, 776; *Od.* 4, 603) is melilot, i. e. sweet clover; *melilotus alba* is called in German: *weisser Pferdeklee* or *Steinklee*; it contains coumarin and is very aromatic, especially when dry. *Θρύον* in the present passage does not denote the true bulrush (*scirpus lacustris*) but reed-grass, i. e. reed canary-grass, *phalaris arundinacea* (Plin. 27, 126). *Κύπειρον* is *cypress-grass* or galangal (*cyperus longus*). *Cyperus* and *carex* represent the largest genera of the grass-like herbs known as *cyperaceae*. The Egyptian papyrus is a species of *cyperus*. In Oregon a variety of *carex acuta* yields an excellent quality of hay. The tubers of *cyperus rotundus*, known as nut-grass, contain an oil which is much used in Upper India as a perfume.

All these plants are ambrosian, i. e. fragrant, so *ἀμβρόσιαι κάπαι* means *mangers full of fragrant forage*. Pindar's *φάτναι Ζηνὸς ἀρχαῖαι* (*O* 13, 92) throws no light on this question.

2. Wine and Blood.

The food of the gods was the fragrant steam arising from the sacrifices, and their drink consisted of the fumes of libations. *Il.* 5, 341 says *οὐ γὰρ σῖτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἶθονα οἶνον*

³ The interpreters of this passage seem to have forgotten that we often have pluperfect aorists.

⁴ K. Wernicke, of Halle, says in Pauly's RE 1, 1809⁴ (1894) with reference to *Il.* 5, 368. 775; 13, 34; *Ov. Met.* 2, 119: *wenn ihre (der Götter) Rosse grasen, so lässt die Erde ihnen Unsterblichkeit als Weide aufspriessen*. The Ovidian *ambrosiae sucus* denotes *ἄρωμα χυλῶδες*, and *praescpia alta* are *faliscæ clatratae*. According to Crönert's Passow, *ambrosia* denotes *duftendes Schönheitsmittel, Futter der Götterrosse, Götterspeise*; contrast the paper on *Manna, Nectar, and Ambrosia* in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 61, No. 3 (1922) pp. 229-236.

(cf. Ps. 50, 13; Judg. 13, 16; 6, 21; 1 K 18, 38; Lev. 9, 24; 2 Chr. 7, 1; 2 Macc. 1, 20-22. 31. 32. 36). The sacrificial fumes were supposed to impart youth and cheer. *Hebe* means *youth*, and *Ganymede* is connected with γάνυσθαι, to rejoice (cf. Judg. 9, 13; Ps. 104, 15; Eccl. 10, 19) while the second part of the name has been combined with μέθυ, our *mead*. Γάνος denotes *refreshment*, drink; we find γάνος ἀμπέλου, γάνος βότρυος, γάνος Διονύσου. Ganymede was afterwards identified with the eleventh sign of the zodiac, Aquarius, the water-bearer: he symbolizes, it may be supposed, the evaporation of water and other liquids. The ascension of Ganymede (who was supposed to have been carried off by Zeus in the form of an eagle; cf. KAT^s 564) may represent the rising of the evaporated vapors to considerable heights above the surface of the earth.

Evaporation, which finally descends in rain, is alluded to in Job 36, 27 (c. 100 B. C.) which should be rendered as follows:

27 He sucks up the drops from the sea,
they are stored for the flood of His rain,
28 Which the clouds cause to flow down
and shower on many a man.

יִגְרַע נִטְפִּים מִיָּם יִקַּן לְאֵר מִטָּרוֹ 27
אֲשֶׁר יִזְלוּ שְׁהִקִּים יִרְעֲפוּ עַל־אֲדָמָה: 28

For the suffix in *mēṣarô*, His rain, cf. Matt. 5, 45; *iuzzaqû*, lit. *they are bottled* < *zíqqâ*, skin-bottle (cf. JAOS 43, 120').

The ancients did not clearly distinguish between vapor, steam, and smoke. In Latin, *vapor* denotes especially a *warm exhalation*; Latin poets use *vapor* for *fire*. We designate also fog and mist as vapors. We speak of a *fog burning off*, and we say not only *the kettle boils*, but also *the whirlpool boils* (AJSL 23, 241).

Ganymede supplanted Hebe in popular mythology when it was customary to have male attendants instead of female cup-bearers. Il. 1, 598 Hephæstus serves the gods with fragrant nectar, dipping it from a bowl: οἶνοχόει γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσω. We apply the term *crater* now to the bowl-shaped outlet of a volcanic vent from which the vapors &c. ascend. Volcanoes do not emit true smoke. *Nectar* is the Semitic *niḫtār*, vaporized (AJP 43, 245). The name Hephæstus may be con-

nected with ἀπτεν, to ignite (ἀφθείς means *set on fire* in Herod. 1, 19) and ἀτσευ, to whirl up. *Od.* 10, 99 we have καπνὸς ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἀτσεων. Hephæstus was the god of volcanoes: the Etna was his smithy, the Cyclopes were his journeymen. As cup-bearer of the gods he symbolizes the ascending fumes of libations.

The fragrant steam of the fat pieces of the sacrifices was afterwards replaced by incense (cf. EB 4196, n. 2) while libations of wine represent a later substitute for the pouring out of the blood of the victims (cf. 1 Cor. 11, 23; EB 4209. 4213. 4203. 4218). In the ancient Jewish ritual, blood and fat were appropriated to JHVH (DB 4 322*,b). Fletcher (1609) uses *fume* for *incense*. Fr. *fumeux* may mean, not only *smoky*, but also *intoxicating* or *intoxicated*. Fr. *fumées du vin* denotes *alcoholic stupor* (JBL 36, 77) while *le fumet du vin* is used of the fragrance of wine, which we generally call *bouquet*.

Newly drawn blood exhales an odorous vapor (*halitus sanguinis*) which is visible on a cold day. Therefore blood is said to smoke. In the third stanza of Schiller's poem *Brutus und Cäsar* (1780) Brutus says: *Auf Philippi's eisernem Altare | raucht der Freiheit letztes Opferblut*, and in l. 81 of *Die Künstler* (1789) we find: *Da rauchte kein unschuldig Blut*. According to Grimm's *Wörterbuch*, this use of *rauchen* may be borrowed from the French; it is not found before the 18th cent. Racine says not only *faire fumer les autels*, but also *Jamais de plus de sang les autels n'ont fumé*. In the third part of Shakespeare's *Henry VI* (2, 3, 21) Richard says to Warwick:

So underneath the belly of their steeds,
That stained their fetlocks in his smoking blood,
The noble gentleman gave up the ghost;

and in *Richard III* Lady Anne says to Gloster, at the hearse of Henry VI (1, 2, 103):

In thy foul throat thou liest! Queen Margaret saw
Thy murderous falchion smoking in his blood.

3. Shady Broom-plants.

The reading *broom-groves* (whose shadow the dismissed bachelor loves) in Shakespeare's *Tempest* (4, 1, 75) is correct (cf. MLN 38, 79). The notes on the illustrated German translation, edited by Gosche and Tschischwitz (Ber-

lin, 1874) p. xxxvi state that *broom-groves* means *Ginsterhaine*. When Elijah fled from the wrath of Jezabel to Beer-sheba in the extreme south of Judah, on the border of the cultivated land, 28 m SW of Hebron, he sat down under a desert-broom. The correct rendering *broom* is given in the margin of RV, not only in 1 K 19, 4, but also in Ps. 120, 4.

The broom-plant (Arab. *rátam*) is the largest and most conspicuous shrub in the deserts S of Palestine. It is said to be 7-10 feet high. The Father of Biblical Geography, Edward Robinson, stated (1841) in his *Biblical Researches* (1, 203) that his Arabs always selected the place of encampment, if possible, in the spot where the broom grew, in order to be sheltered by it at night from the wind; and during the day, when they often went in advance of the camels, he found them not unfrequently sitting or sleeping under a bush of *rátam* to protect them from the sun (EB 2647). This broom-plant, which grows in all the deserts of the Holy Land, the Sinaitic Peninsula, and Egypt, is often the only refuge from the blazing sun of the desert (DB 2, 825^b).

Similarly the dwarf-pine (*Pinus pumilio* or *montana*) is a favorite shelter for the chamois, although it is only a few feet high. This recumbent bush, which abounds on the higher slopes of the Bavarian and Tyrolese Alps, is called there *Latschen*, while in the Giant Mountains, on the boundary of Silesia and Czechoslovakia, where it is found at an altitude of c. 4000 feet, it is known as *Knieholz* (EB¹¹ 21, 623; 23, 325^a).

Plantagenet was a nickname of the ancestor of the Angevine line of English kings, Count Geoffrey of Anjou, who used to wear in his cap a sprig of the broom-plant (*planta genista*, Fr. *plante genêt*). He did not wear it as a plume on his helmet. In early summer the bright yellow flowers of the broom-plant are said to make the open country of Anjou and Maine (S of Normandy, E of Brittany) *a blaze of living gold* (EB¹¹ 21, 725b⁴). The blossoms of some of the varieties of the Palestinian broom are not yellow, but purplish white.

4. The Egyptian Prototype of Ps. 104.

One of the most famous passages in the Bible is the pentastich in Ps. 104, 19-23, describing how by nightfall all the beasts of

the forest creep forth, the young lions roaring after their prey and seeking their meat from God, but at sunrise they retreat and lay them down in their dens, while man goes forth to his work and to his labor until evening. This psalm may have been composed c. B. C. 100, but we have an ancient Egyptian prototype, the great hymn to the Sun, which originated c. B. C. 1370. It has often been translated, *e. g.* in Breasted's *Ancient Documents*, and a rendering, by Griffith, is given in *The World's Best Literature*; cf. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder* (Tübingen, 1909) vol. 1, p. 189; Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, fourth edition (Göttingen, 1917) pp. 155. 241; Kittel, *Die Psalmen* (Leipsic, 1922) pp. 452-454; G. Roeder, *Urkunden zur Religion des alten Ägypten* (Jena, 1915) p. 63; A. Scharff, *Ägyptische Sonnenlieder* (Berlin, 1922) p. 62; A. Erman, *Die Literatur der Ägypter* (Leipsic, 1923) p. 358; H. Schäfer, *Religion und Kunst von El-Amarna* (Berlin, 1923) p. 56 (K. Sethe). I am indebted for some of these references to Dr. Ember who has also made some valuable suggestions with regard to the translation of the Egyptian text.

The lines of this ancient Egyptian hymn illustrating Ps. 104, 19-23 may be rendered as follows:

If thou goest down in the western heavens,
 the land becomes dark like death,
 They sleep in their chambers with veiled heads,
 no eye beholds the other. . .
 Every lion leaves his lair,
 all reptiles begin to bite . . .
 At dawn thou risest again
 and shinest as sun by day . . .
 They awake and stand on their feet
 after thou hast made them rise.
 They wash, and put on their garments,
 lift their arms in praise at thy shine.
 The whole land performs its labor,
 all cattle rejoice on the pasture;
 The trees and herbage are verdant,
 the birds fly forth from their nests
 and raise their wings to praise thee.

The Hebrew text of Ps. 104, 19-23 should be restored as follows:

שָׁמֶשׁ יָדְעָה מְבֹאָו:	עֲשִׂיתָ יָרֵחַ לְמוֹעֲדִים	19
בִּרְחֹמַי כָּל־הַיּוֹת יָעַר:	חֲשֹׁת־הַשָּׁךְ וַיְהִי לַיְלָה	20
לִבְקֹשׁ מֵאֵל אֲכָלִים:	הַכַּפִּירִים שְׂאֲגִים לְטָרֶף	21
וְעַל־מְעֹנֵתָם יִרְבְּצוּן	תִּפְּרָח הַשָּׁמֶשׁ וַיֵּאֱסֹפוּ	22
וּלְעִבְרָתוֹ עַד־עֶרֶב:	וַיֵּצֵא אָדָם לַפֶּעַל	23

This pentastich may be rendered as follows:

- 19 Thou madest the moon for set times,
didst assign to the sun his setting.
20 If Thou makest darkness, night falls
when all beasts of the wilderness prowl;
21 The lions roar for their prey,
claiming their food from God.
22 When Thou makest the sun rise, they retreat
and stretch themselves out in their lairs,
23 While man goes forth to his work.
and to his labor till even.

These lines are paraphrased in Théophile's poem *Le Matin* (1620): see *Modern Philology*, vol. 21 (Chicago, 1923) p. 2. There is a special commentary on this psalm by Theo. Fritz: *Comment. in Ps. civ* (Argent. 1821).

5. Blood and Water.

The Johannine account of the crucifixion (which may have been composed in Asia Minor c. 135 B. C.) states that one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came out blood and water. This is physiologically impossible. The hypothesis (EB 961) that the point of the lance touched perhaps a discolored wheal, bleb, or exudation, such as scourging might have left, is unsatisfactory. John 19, 35 implies the preternatural character of the combination of blood and water. Both vv. 34 and 35 represent a subsequent insertion which may be later than 1 John 5, 6. The sequel of v. 33 is v. 36 (cf. JAOS 43, 125). Also v. 37 is secondary (cf. IJG⁵ 276, n. 1; Est. 22, ad 14; JBL 32, 121, u): *they shall look upon him whom they pierced* (cf. Rev. 1, 7) is a quotation from Zech. 12, 10 where we must read *uē-'ālū 'al-'āšēr duqqārū*, they will lament (cf. the gloss in v. 10^b) over those who were stabbed

(contrast Nowack³ and Sellin *ad loc.*) which refers to the assassination (Feb. 135 B. C.) of the Maccabee Simon and two of his sons at a banquet given by his treacherous son-in-law, the governor of Jericho (1 Mac. 16, 16). Nor can Ps. 22, 17 be combined with the crucifixion (BL 121, †). The quotation in John 19, 36 refers to the paschal lamb; according to Ex. 12, 9, 46; Num. 9, 12, the bones of it were not to be broken, *i. e.* it was to be roasted whole, like a barbecued ox, not legs, shoulders, &c. (cf. also Ps. 34, 21). Jesus was regarded as the paschal lamb.

Hibbîṭû before *ēlāi* in Zech. 12, 10 is a gloss; it may be a corruption of *hēlîlû* or *hiṭ'abbēlû*. For *ēlāi* we must read *ālû*; we find *ēlî* for *ālû*, they lamented, in Joel 1, 8 (AJP 43, 241). *Eṭ* before *āšēr* in Zech. 12, 10 is miswritten for *ēl* = '*al* (contrast *ēl-ḥoq* for *ēṭ-ḥoq* in Ps. 2, 7). *Ἔνθεν* in John 19, 34 does not necessarily mean *pierced* (see, however, John 20, 17): *νύττω* is used also of a person nudging someone with the elbow (*Od.* 14, 485).⁵ Contrast J. Preuss, *Biblisch-talmudische Medizin* (Berlin, 1921) p. 241.

The soldier touched the body of Jesus with his spear in order to ascertain whether or not He was really dead. Troopers sometimes lance prostrate bodies of the enemy in order to make sure that they will not rise and attack them in the rear. If a man is alive he must have extraordinary will-power not to stir under such a test.

The object of the addition that blood and water came out of the side touched by the spear is to emphasize the divine nature of Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is not a human being, but a deity; cf. W. Bousset und W. Heitmüller, *Die Schriften des NT*, third edition vol. 4 (Göttingen, 1918) p. 28, l. 3. When Diomedes' spear pierced the hand of Aphrodite, who had come to save her son Æneas, the blood that ran from her wound was not red blood, but *ichor*, which is used by Hippocrates, Plato, and Aristotle for lymph, *i. e.* blood without red corpuscles and diluted with water. According to *Il.* 5, 341 (cf. above, p. 48⁴) the gods eat no bread, nor do they drink

⁵Also Arab. *šákaza* means both to pierce (syn. *ṭá'ana*) with a lance and to poke with the finger, syn. *náxasahu* (cf. *náxaza* and *uáxaza*) *bi-'l-icba'i*.

wine; therefore they are bloodless and are called immortal (ἀναίμονές εἰσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται). They were, however, not anemic, but hydremic: their blood was watery. In German, *Blutwasser* is used for ἰχώρ. The question whether *Il.* 5, 341/2 is a post-Homeric addition has no bearing on the present problem.

6. Eng. *to go phut* and Ger. *futsch*, Fr. *f . . t*.

AJP 43, 242 showed that the German prototype of our *to go flooie* or *blooey* (e. g. *it's all flooie* or *my luck went blooey at the wrong moment*) is not derived from the Yiddish *pleite gehn*, which has a different meaning, but corresponds to the Shakespearean *to go whistle*. The exact equivalent of Ger. *flöten gehn* is the old proverbial phrase *to go blow one's flute*. In *Vox Populi Vox Dei* (c. 1547) which is printed in W. C. Hazlitt's *Popular Poetry* (3, 284) we find:

When thei have any sute,
They maye goo blowe their flute;
This goithe the common brute.

Sute is the modern *suit*, pursuit, and *brute* the modern *bruit*, Fr. *bruit*, rumor, report; *this* = *thus*, and *goithe* = *goeth*. The Shakespearean *to go whistle* is synonymous with the Chaucerian *to blow the buck's horn*. In the *Miller's Tale* (c. 1386) we read *Absolom may blowe the bukkes horn*. Skeat in his notes on the *Canterbury Tales* (l. 1838) thinks this means *to console oneself with any frivolous employment*. According to OD, *to blow the buck's horn* signifies *to have his labor for his pains*, whereas CD explains it to mean *to lose one's troubles*, to go whistle. Skeat quotes Thomas Wright's remark, *I presume, this (phrase to blow the buck's horn) was a service that generally was unrewarded*.

To go whistle means orig. *to pass swiftly through the air* like a whistling bullet. Our echoic words for this sound are *whiz* or *zip* or *phit*. Gunpowder and cannons were manufactured in England as early as 1344, and an illustration of a gun is found in the Oxford MS *De officiis regum* of 1325 (EB¹¹ 12, 723^b). The German words imitating the sound produced by the detonation of fire-arms are *piff*, *paff*, *puff* (cf. Fr. *paf*, *pouf*) and the denominative verb *verpuffen* is used in Goethe's *Faust*

(2862) in the sense of *to make go whistle* or *to fling away*. We use *to pop off* for *to disappear* or *depart suddenly*, also for *to die*. *Paffen* means in German: *to smoke*, just as we say *he puffed his pipe*. In French we have *bouffarde*, short tobacco-pipe, and *bouffard*, smoker, also *bouffée de tabac*, smoke. For *piff* and *paff* or *piffle* we may use also *buff*, e. g. *that is all buff*. An old phrase for *to say nothing* is *to say neither baff nor buff*. To *baff* is to *bark*; in Austria, *bäffen* has the same meaning. Our *to be baffled* corresponds originally to the Ger. *baff* or *paff sein*, i. e. *surprised at the sudden discharge of a gun*; cf. Ger. *wie angedonnert*, thunderstruck.

OD quotes the phrases *The air was full of the phit-phit-phit of the bullets* (1898) and *The pert crack of the Lee-Metford, the 'phit' of whose bullet is lost in the whirr of a lead-coated stone from the Matabele arsenal* (1896). Instead of *phit* we find also *phut*, e. g. *Thudd! went the first gun, and phutt! came faintly back, as its shell burst in the zariba*, i. e. a Sudanese fenced camp (JAOS 37, 254). *To go phut* means *to go to the deuce*, to be lost. In a story, published in SEP, Jan. 6, 1923, p. 66^a) the squire, who has lost his fortune by backing the wrong horses, says to his old butler: *I had made some little provision for you in my will, but I'm afraid that's gone phut—hey*. This explains the use of the Fr. *foutu* which is generally not pronounced in polite society and indicated in print by *f . . .*. In German, *futsch*, which Kluge combines with this objectionable French word, is used in the same way. The French word is, as a rule, derived from the verb corresponding to Lat. *futuere* which is used of sexual intercourse and which is identical with Gr. *φτερεύειν*, to plant, beget; *φυτόν* denotes *scion*, offspring, child. In Oriental literature the wife of a man is often called his *field* (JHUC 296, 30; JAOS 36, 419). I believe, however, that this ineffable Fr. *f . . .* in phrases like *votre entreprise est f . . .* or *cet homme est f . . .* is an adaptation of the echoic *phut* imitating the sound of a whistling bullet. Cf. Sanders' *Wörterbuch* s. *ft*, *wutsch*, *witsch*.

Flooy or *blooy* is used also in the sense of *crazy*. We read e. g. *He sure was flooy in the dome—this guy Carey*. *Booze had certainly wrecked his common sense* (Arthur Somers Roche, *Find the Woman*, c. xxxii, printed in the Baltimore

American, Oct. 29, 1922, p. 10, D, col. 3). The original meaning seems to be *to have a swelled head*, to be blown up, puffed up, inflated (Fr. *bouffi*). We say also *to blow up a scheme*.

7. The Cuneiform Prototype of *Cipher* and *Zero*.

The terms *cipher* and *zero* are originally identical, just as *cattle* and *chattel* are doublets of *capital*, principal, stock, or *grotto* a doublet of *crypt*; in German we have *Krypt*, *Grotte*, and *Gruft*. Heb. *qîṭôr* (< *qaṭâr* > *niqṭâr* > *νέκταρ*, AJP 43, 245¹) is a doublet of Heb. *ʿašân*, smoke (JAOS 42, 375). Both *cipher* and *zero* (< *zefiro*) are ultimately derived from Ass. *šipru*, message (*Kings* 198, 47) < *šapâru*, to despatch, prop. *to cause to hasten*, Ass. *šapâru* being a *Š* of *pr*, to run, which we have in Arab. *fârra*, to flee; cf. *farraṭa*, to outrun (syn. *sâbaqa ū-taqâddama*) and *fârqaʿa*, to run very fast (*ʿâdâ šadîda*) as well as *nâfara*, to run away (*jâziʿa ū-tabâʿada*).

Shophar, the name of the ancient Hebrew wind-instrument which is still used in the Jewish ritual, denotes orig. *wild ram* or *he-goat*. Just as we use *sheep* for *sheepskin*, or *calf* for *calfskin* (ZDMG 65, 108, 17; contrast JBL 38, 50) so the Hebrews employed *qôḇēl* both for *ram* and *ram's horn*. Heb. *šôṭār* = *šâpar* = Ass. *šapparu*, wild ram, orig. *swift* (WZKM 23, 362¹). It may have been an ibex; the Semites made no clear distinction between sheep and goats. We call the *Mazama montana*, which is an antelope, the Rocky Mountain *goat*. The story of the fall of Jericho in the Book of Joshua is due to a misunderstanding of the term *qôl šôṭār*, sound of a horn, which denotes the subterraneous rumbling preceding or accompanying an earthquake (JBL 38, 143).

Both *cipher* and *zero* are generally supposed to be derived from Arab. *ṣifr*, zero, lit. *void*, emptiness (cf. the glossary of Oriental loanwords in French, appended to Littré's dictionary). But the etymological equivalent of *cipher* in German, *Ziffer*, denotes the numeral characters 1, 2, 3, &c. which we call *Arabic figures*, while the Arabs term them *raqm Hindî*, Indian characters. Arab. *raqm* signifies *writing* and *figure* (arithmetical character). *Raqîmah* means *line*, writing, letter. Heb. *riqmâ* denotes *embroidery* > It. *ricamamento*. To *cipher* means *to use numerical figures*. Doing simple sums is called

ciphering. A slate on which arithmetical problems are worked out is a *ciphering-slate*. We can say *to cipher up* the cost of an undertaking for *to figure out* the cost. *Number* may denote a written arithmetic figure, and Horace (*Epist.* 1, 2, 27) uses *numerus* in the sense of our *cipher*, Ger. *Null*, just as Aristophanes (*Nub.* 1204) has ἀριθμός in this sense (cf. Eurip. *Heracl.* 1000). Our term *figure-head* for a person without any real authority is taken from the ornamental figure at the head of a ship (Ger. *Gallionsfigur*, *Bugfigur*; cf. Fr. *galion*, large ship, It. *galeone*). The phrase *he is a figure*, on the other hand, means *he is a person of standing*, while we call a person of no weight a mere *cipher*, and in German you say *er ist eine Null* (cf. Fr. *c'est un zéro en chiffre*). Luther spelled *Ziffer* with *c*, and in the 16th and 17th centuries *Ziffer* was used for *zero*.

Diophantus of Alexandria (c. 250 A. D.) used ἀριθμός as the term for the unknown quantity in an algebraic problem. His symbol, corresponding to our *x*, looks somewhat like *s*, but it may be a contraction of the first two letters of ἀριθμός (EB¹¹ 8, 288^b; 1, 616^b). There was no final sigma in the days of Diophantus; but the Arabian algebraists took the Diophantic symbol for a *s* and substituted their *š* for it. This letter may have been called *šai*, as in Coptic, although Pedro de Alcala (1505) calls it *xin*; see Lagarde, *Petri Hispani de lingua Arabica libri duo*, p. 3; *Mitteil.* 1, 136. 170; 4, 375). *Z* is called in Arabic both *zâ'* and *zâi*. Pedro de Alcala has *Zéy*, also *Ay* for *'ain*, and *Gáy* for *ġain*; for *'ain*, eye, Lagarde's edition (p. 327) gives *âñ*. In Syriac the *'ain* is called *'ê*, and *z*: *zain*, *zên*, or *zai*. Lam. 1, 7; 2, 7; 3, 19; 4, 7, MSS of ܙ have not only ܙܐܘܪ, but also ܙܐܘ and ܙܗ. Also in the Ethiopic alphabet *z* is called *zâi* or *zai* (BSS 132). *Šai* is the common Arabic word for *thing*; in modern Arabic it is often shortened to a simple *š*, e. g. *balâš*, for nothing < *bi-lâ-šai'i*, without a thing. The Italian algebraists substituted for it *cosa*. Rule of *coss* (= It. *regola della cosa*) was an early English name for *algebra*, and algebraists were called *cossists*. In Germany the term *Cossisten* was used during the 15th and 16th centuries, occasionally also during the 17th. Sp. *x* was formerly pronounced *š* (EB¹¹ 25, 576^{am}. 578^{as}; JHUC 30, 75). Arab. *šai* was therefore rendered *xei* (e. g. Lag. *Petr. Hisp.* p. 158, l. 20^a) and our

x is an abbreviation of this term, just as the Arabs use their *š* for this purpose.

Ass. *šipru*, message, appears in Hebrew (with *s* = Ass. *š*; cf. JBL 36, 144, l. 13) as *seṗr* which means *epistle*, letter, writing, book, just as Arab. *kitâb*, writing, is commonly used for *book*. The denominative Hebrew verb *saṗâr* denotes both *to write* and *to count*, enumerate, recount, just as our *tell* signifies *to number*, count, enumerate, and *to recount*, narrate, relate. I have subsequently noticed that Sanders states, according to Adelung and others Ger. *Ziffer* is derived from an Arabic word corresponding to Heb. *saṗâr*, to count, write. In Arabic, *sâfar* means *travel*, voyage, campaign; but the primary connotation is something *sent out*; Arab. *sifârah* denotes *legation*, embassy, prop. *mission*.

Writing was originally a sort of cryptography. The characters of the ancient Scandinavian alphabets are called *runes*, and *rune* denotes orig. *secret* or *mystery* (cf. JAOS 43, 123'). We use *hieroglyph* for any figure or character supposed to have a mysterious or enigmatic significance. Therefore *cipher* may denote also *cryptography*, and *to decipher* means *to succeed in reading obscure characters*. The corresponding German word is *entziffern* < *Ziffer*, arithmetical figure, which is ultimately derived from Ass. *šipru*, message. Littré's statement, *De la signification de zéro, chiffre a passé à la signification générale de signe de numération*, is incorrect. Contrast ZDMG 57, 784.

8. The Poems of Isaiah.

The Hebrew prophets were patriotic statesmen and literary artists like Demosthenes (JBL 38, 147, l. 10 and 161'). According to EB 2188, 19, Isaiah was too great to be a literary artist. We might just as well say that Martin Luther, the creator of the present literary language of Germany, was too great a religious genius to be a literary artist (cf. JHUC 287, 43) or that Edmund Burke was too great a statesman to be a master of elaborate composition. Driver (LOT 227') speaks of Isaiah's superb poetical genius.

The phrase *The word which Isaiah saw* appears in a new light if we compare the statement of the author of the cuneiform epic *Ša-gimir dadmê*, that the god Išu let him see by night in a

dream the lines of the poem, and when he awoke in the morning, he did not omit anything, nor did he add (Deut. 4, 2; 13, 1) a single word (KB 6, 70⁴; ZA 34, 90). In his account (published in *The New Orleans Star*, reprinted in the *Baltimore American*, Dec. 31, 1922, D 3, col. 4) of the writing of *Maryland! My Maryland!* J. R. Randall says that, in April, 1861, some powerful spirit seemed to impress him, and almost involuntarily he proceeded, about midnight, to write the song *Maryland! My Maryland!* The whole poem was dashed off rapidly when once begun. It was composed under what may be called a conflagration of the senses, if not an inspiration of the intellect. Mozart wrote the overture to *Don Giovanni* during the night preceding the first performance; he no doubt saw the whole orchestral score with his mind's eye.

Randall's martial song was adapted to the tune of the German college song *Lauriger Horatius*, which is the German folk-song *O Tannebaum*, a modification of an old poem (mentioned about the middle of the 16th cent.): *Ach Tannenbaum, ach Tannenbaum, du bist ein edles Reis*. There is a similar short poem by Uhland, written in 1809, *O Tannenbaum, du edles Reis, bist Sommer und Winter grün*. The oldest form of the tune of *Maryland! My Maryland!* is found in 1799 in a song praising the journeyman carpenters: *Es lebe hoch, es lebe hoch der Zimmermannsgeselle!*

Isaiah was more aristocratic than his younger Judean contemporary Micah who has been called The Prophet of the Poor (JBL 38, 162, l. 5) or his Israelitish contemporary Amos who was a gardener living in Judah after he had been banished from the Northern Kingdom (JBL 35, 287): he had constant access to the court and presence of the king, but he denounces the ruling caste as vigorously as did Micah and Amos (cf. e. g. Is. 1, 16. 17. 23. 26 and Mic. 17; also *Monist* 29, 298).

Few of the poems in the Book of Isaiah are genuine. It has been known for nearly 150 years that cc. 40-66 (*Deutero-Isaiah*) cannot be the work of Isaiah; c. 40 e. g. (see the translation in Drugulin's *Marksteine*; cf. JHUC 163, 57) must have been composed toward the end of the Exile (540) and several poems are Maccabean (170-70 B. C.). These later poems are found not only in cc. 40-66, but also in the first part of the book: Is.

9, 1-6; 11, 1-9 refer to Zerubbabel (AJP 40, 67-72; *Monist* 29, 296. 299) and cc. 24-27 are Maccabean; also 37, 22-34 is aimed at Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. v. 25 and 1 Mac. 1, 17; 2 Mac. 5, 1; see also *Mic.* 14, n. 4). Hugo Grotius (1644) referred several passages (e. g. 63, 1-6; cf. JHUC 163, 49) to Judas Maccabæus, but he regarded them as Isaianic predictions (JHUC 163, 54^a, l. 17). Nor can we say that Ibn Ezra (1145 A.D.) regarded cc. 40-66 as non-Isaianic (cf. Winter-Wünsche, *Jüd. Lit.* 2, 295; contrast Baudissin's *Einleitung*, p. 388). The final redaction of the book was not completed before 70 B.C. which is also the approximate date of the final redaction of the Psalter (ZDMG 58, 629, n. 2).

There are no Messianic prophecies in Isaiah or, for that matter, in any book of OT. Also the so-called eschatological passages have, as a rule, a definite historical background (AJP 43, 240).

Just as the crossing of the Red Sea at the time of the Exodus laid the foundation of the Mosaic Law, so the wonderful preservation of Jerusalem in the days of Isaiah (701 B.C.) established the religion of the prophets, which is regarded as the basis of Christianity (*Mic.* 14. 29, n. 33; TOCR 1, 268).

9. The Adventures of Odysseus.

Vol. 3 of Brockhaus' new *Handbuch des Wissens* (1923) states that the Odyssey is based on yarns of Greek sailors who opened up the Black Sea to commerce and colonization; afterwards these stories were transferred to the west. The Odyssey undoubtedly influenced the later versions of the expedition of the Argonauts, but the adventures of Odysseus were not founded on this legend, although it was known in Homeric times. There is some connection, however, between Odysseus and the Black Sea. A great many etymologies of the name Odysseus have been proposed, but none of them is satisfactory. The combination of the name with ὀδυσάμενος, angry,⁶ so that the name would be connected with Lat. *odisse*, to hate (*Od.* 19, 407; cf. also 1, 62) is merely a popular etymology like the numerous inter-

⁶ Ὀδυσάμενος may have been taken to mean ἀπέχθημα; cf. ἐχθροδαίμων and the active and passive uses of ἀπεχθής and ἀπέχθεσθαι.

pretations of names which we find in OT, *e. g.* the derivation of *adám*, man, from *ādāmā*, earth (contrast OC 33, 86) or *iššā*, woman, from *iš*, man (OC 33, 37, n. 65). Nor does *Job* mean *object of enmity*, persecuted, or *turning to God*, penitent: it denotes a man who *came back*, which is an old Sumerian phrase for *regained his former condition* (JAOS 41, 184').⁷

It is strange that, so far as I know, no one has ever thought of connecting Odysseus with the names of two Euxine ports, 'Οδησσός, which afterwards appears in the form 'Οδυσσός. One of these ports was on the western shore of the Black Sea and is now represented by the Bulgarian port Varna. The other was NE of Odessa on the northern shore. The old name Odessa was given to this Russian port on Aug. 22, 1794, by the Semiramis of the North, the Russian empress Catharine II. According to Strabo (149. 157) there was also a city 'Οδύσσεια in southeastern Spain. 'Οδησσός may mean *emporium*;⁸ it may be connected with the verb *ōdān*, to sell, orig. *to export*, which we find in three passages of the Euripidean satyric drama *Cyclops* (12. 98. 133). In l. 133 Odysseus says to the chief of the satyrs, Silenus, *ōdḡson ḡmīn sītōn*, sell us food. *Tà ōdaīa* means *goods*, articles of trade, cargo (*Od.* 8, 163, 15, 445). It is, of course, derived from *ōdós*, way, just as Heb. *ōrēhā*, caravan, is connected with *ōrah*, way; so the sarcastic characterization which the Phæacian⁹ wrestler, Euryalus, gives of Odysseus would practically be correct: he says (*Od.* 8, 162-164) that Odysseus looked like an

ἀρχὸς ναυτᾶων οἱ τε πρηκτῆρες ἔασιν,
φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος εἰσιν ὀδαίων
κερδέων θ' ἀρπαλέων.

'Οδός, way, is connected with Lat. *solea*, sole, sandal. Hesychius gives *ύλία*, sole. It is interesting to note that the German denominative verb *sohlen* means *to fib*, to lie. The Ionians of

⁷ Cf. also Arab. *tāba jismu-'l-marīdi*.

⁸ We can hardly assume that 'Ολυνθος is a Thracian form of 'Οδυσσός (with *νθ* = *ντ* = *ττ* = *σσ*): we must remember that figs (as well as olives and oranges) grow on the northern shore of the Ægean.

⁹ The ancients believed that the island of the Phæacians, which Homer calls Scheria, was Corcyra, the present Corfu, on the highway from Greece to the west.

Asia Minor, who were great seafarers, dropped their *h*'s very early; they had no *spiritus asper* (Brugmann-Thumb, 1913, § 108).

In Latin, Odysseus appears as *Ulixes* (ZDMG 61, 195; JBL 35, 322'). The Attic form was 'Ολυττεύς, the Corinthian: 'Ολισεύς. We have the *l* also in the name of the westernmost of European capitals, Lisbon, a modification of the ancient name *Olisipo*, also written *Ulyssipo*, which was said to have been founded by Ulysses.

Odysseus is the typical representative of the old sailor race of ancient Greece, who encountered many adventures in all parts of the unknown seas. The best equivalent of Odysseus would be *adventurer*, i. e. one engaged in foreign trade and colonization. The commercial company (first established at Antwerp and chartered in England in 1406 by the first king of the House of Lancaster, Henry IV) who carried on trading and colonizing enterprises in North America and other parts of the world was known as Merchant Adventurers. William Tyndale, who translated the NT (1526) and the Pentateuch (1530) into English, was Chaplain to the English Adventurers at Antwerp, and he was succeeded in this office by John Rogers who published in 1537, under the pseudonym of Thomas Matthew,¹⁰ a complete English Bible which was a compilation from the renderings of Tyndale and Coverdale. In 1618 James I, under whose auspices AV was completed in 1611, granted a charter to the Company of Adventurers Trading into Africa.

Etymologies of ancient names are always precarious, but the interpretation of the name Odysseus as *Adventurer* is perhaps as good as any of the explanations that have been proposed.

PAUL HAUPT.

¹⁰ Cf. C. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.* (London, 1895) p. 220; Richard Lovett, *The Printed English Bible* (London, 1894) p. 76; EB¹¹ 23, 456^b.

III.—AENEAS' CITY AT THE MOUTH OF THE TIBER.

In his deliberate efforts to reconstruct in imagination a plausible milieu for a heroic plot Vergil seems to have submitted himself to an unusually severe course of careful observation. When reading the description of the votive and thank offerings that hung about the old temple of Lavinium (VII, 184):

captivi pendent currus curvaeque secures
et cristae capitum et portarum ingentia claustra
spiculaque clipeique ereptaque rostra carinis,

and a dozen other similar passages, one comes to comprehend the method by which Vergil gained his information in rummaging through temple stores of bygone ages. In his massive collection of Vergilian archæology (*Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie*, Paris, 1919) Carcopino was wholly justified in looking for a precise and actual site for the city which Vergil in several passages of the *Aeneid* VII-XII says that Aeneas built near the mouth of the Tiber. By the mere chance that the war kept the noted French scholar away from Italy when certain important excavations were being made, he happened to publish a theory which proves now to be untenable, though based upon a sound feeling for Vergil's method of work and a logical calculation of probabilities. The "Troja," which he rightly assumes, he places hypothetically at a point on the Tiber where a tower of the Sullan wall has since been found, whereas the original walls of Ostia have now been discovered some five hundred yards nearer the sea, the very walls, in my opinion, which Vergil, with a slight license, intended the reader to have in mind when he mentioned Aeneas' first city in Latium.

In the *Notizie* of 1914, p. 426, Calza published the first traces found of this inner city. What he then had discovered was a remarkable gate 5.80 m. wide and protected on the inside by a rectangular enclosure 10.30 m. long. He rightly saw that it was an old city or fortress gate the corresponding walls of which must be looked for on the west and not on the east. In studying this peculiar structure in 1916 I discovered that it was made of the stone that was used in the first Concord temple of

366 B. C. and in the post-Gallic Palatine wall of about the same time. Since the stone proved to be native to the region of Fidenae, and was not used in any structure of Rome after the fourth century, I suggested that this Ostian fort was to be placed in the fourth century B. C. and that the structure may have been made out of the blocks of Fidenae's razed walls (*Am. Jour. Arch.* 1918, 182 ff.). Calza has now traced the four walls of this old fortress-city and published a good preliminary account of it in *Notizie* 1923, pp. 178-9. It proves to be only 193 x 126 meters in extent, and is situated about 200 meters from the river and about 400 meters from the line where the seacoast ran in Vergil's day. There are traces of buildings, as old as the walls themselves, in many places inside the cincture (*ibid.*, p. 179), so that Vergil's mention of *tecta* (VII, 160) and of an *urbs* (IX, 8, 48, 473, 639, etc.) is wholly appropriate. Indeed I do not feel certain that the forum was originally here, as Calza seems to think (*loc. cit.*, p. 179), for the forum pavement seems to belong to about 100 B. C. and it covers the foundations of many old houses. It is not improbable that Vergil learned from old men who could inform him that the forum was actually the site of former dwellings and temples.¹ Calza has acutely noticed the additional fact that the streets of the imperial city inside and outside these walls show unmistakably the traces of the older pomerium spaces. Since Vergil speaks repeatedly of the *fossæ* of Aeneas' camp (IX, 143, 314, 506, 567, etc.), this observation is of importance in showing that Vergil had ocular evidence for his assumption of moats as well as of walls.

How much of the old walls Vergil could actually see we do not definitely know. The east, west, and south gates were certainly in sight and probably in fair condition since these had been repaired with a harder stone in the second century B. C. Parts of the walls near these gates were probably also largely intact, since here and there they still exist, incorporated in Augustan and later structures. Most of the north wall (the one nearest the river) has disappeared down to a very low level.

¹ The older market place may have been where the Capitolium of the empire was built or possibly even between the river and the wall.

That part was presumably torn down before Vergil's day. In fact Vergil seems to assume that the fort extended to the river since he represents Turnus as escaping from the interior by way of the river (IX, 790, 815).

This structure, as we have said, belongs to the fourth century B. C. and not to the heroic period; but it is to be noted that the material is so friable and so poorly laid that it gave an appearance of far greater age than it actually had. Even Ennius (Ann. II. 22, Vahlen) attributed the old Ostian colony to Ancus Marcius, and he doubtless had this same wall in mind. Vergil, though a delver in antiquities, takes the liberties of a poet to the extent at least of making free use of sixth and seventh century material for his picture. He does so in the case of Carthage, Cumae, Ardea and the Etruscan towns and would naturally do so in the case of what was generally thought to be of regal age at Ostia.

We are now in a position to review what Vergil says of his "Troja,"² and it will be seen that it fits the position of this old colonial fort of Ostia. Aeneas turned the prows toward land soon after entering the Tiber (VII, 35-6), and learned by an omen that

Advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant (VII, 145).

After sending envoys to King Latinus, he personally marks the pomerium of his new fortress-city, and superintends the building:

*Moliturque locum, primasque in litore sedes
Castrorum in morem pinnis atque aggere cingit* (VII, 158-9).

It is a city with homes (*sedes*) and has a wall with turrets. (The foundations of the old gates that have now come to view are so strong that there can be little doubt of their having supported towers.) When a few days later, the Latin army comes to besiege the town its walls are complete, and the government seems to be organized, for the inhabitants are henceforth spoken of as *cives*:

"Quis globus, O cives, caligine volvitur atra?
Ferte citi ferrum, date tela, ascendite muros" (IX, 36-7).

² Cf. X, 27, and VII, 158, with Servius' note: *sciendum civitatem quam primo fecit Aeneas Troiam dictam secundum Catonem.*

The city stood near the river, with the ships drawn up close to its walls:

Classem, quae lateri castrorum adjuncta latebat,
Aggeribus saeptam circum et fluvialibus undis (IX, 69-70).

The Latins attack the south side (the left side from the point of view of Rome):

Aeneadae duri murorum in parte sinistra
Opposuerunt aciem (nam dextera cingitur amni)
Ingentisque tenent fossas et turribus altis
Stant maestis. (IX, 468-71)

In the tenth book Aeneas comes by ships from Caere with Etruscan reinforcements. It then appears that the camp is so near the sea that the Latins see the fleet coming and rush to the seashore to attack the enemy disembarking (X, 260-286). The landing is effected from the sea coast itself, not from the river:

Multi servare recursus
Languentis pelagi et brevibus se credere saltu . . .
Sed mare inoffensum crescenti adlabitur aestu (X, 288-91).

After a long contest on the beach the Trojans reach and relieve the besieged camp (X, 603-4) and push on beyond, fighting along the river bank (X, 833) until Mezentius falls. Then the Latins withdraw to Lavinium where the battle of the last two books takes place.

Many parallels from the Iliad have been pointed out in these last books of the Aeneid. It is, of course, not to be denied that Homeric lines occurred to Vergil's memory as he wrote. But if the reader will take his Aeneid down to Ostia and read the intense scenes of books VII-X among the old ruins of the walls that have now been excavated, he will discover that the poet constructed these scenes independently and composed them with a clear and consistent plan. Scholars have too long studied Vergil with lists of parallel passages in hand. If the reader will but reconstruct Vergil's life and surroundings, and try to visualize what Vergil saw and realize Vergil's experiences, he will find a sensitive and imaginative poet behind the lines.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

IV.—THE LETTERS ON THE BLOCKS OF THE SERVIAN WALL.

When Bruzza¹ first discussed the letters and marks that are found on many of the blocks of the "Servian Wall" at Rome it was generally supposed that the wall belonged to the regal period. Consequently scholars assumed that at least some of the marks might be Etruscan. Unfortunately little was then known about the Etruscan alphabet, and practically nothing about early Latin writing since the stele of the Forum and the Duenos Vase had not been found. When the discovery of some fifth-century tombs inside the wall on the Esquiline threw doubts on the supposed age of the "Servian Wall" scholars tacitly dropped every reference to a possible connection between these letters and the Etruscan alphabet. Forms that did not seem to be satisfactorily explained as Roman were interpreted as arbitrary marks.

A few years ago² I called attention to the fact that the material of which these walls were built was quarried in Veientine territory soon after Veii's fall. If this is so it would seem not improbable that the blocks were cut by Veientine captives and that the letters, which are quarry marks, are Veientine characters. Since we have as yet no inscriptions that are demonstrably of Veientine origin, and since Veii's language—spoken

¹ *Annali Inst.* 1876, 71 ff. There has never been an adequate discussion or even a complete record of them. Bruzza, who copied only those known in 1876, has been severely criticized for his inexact transcriptions. Jordan examined only a few using chiefly poor copies made by others (*Hermes* 1873, p. 482; 1876, pp. 127 and 461; *Topographie I*, p. 259). Richter, *Über antike Steinmetzzeichen*, 1885, has reproduced two photographs of the wall that lies near the railway station. This is very valuable since at least half of the marks recorded by the photographs are now illegible. But there is reason to suspect that the marks on the photographic negatives were reinforced before printing and that some inaccuracies thus crept in. Richter unfortunately did not take records from other parts of the wall. *Notizie Scavi*, 1907, p. 507 contains a good photograph of a few marks, and Graffunder reports a few new readings in *Klio*, 1911, p. 109. In this note I have used only what I have actually seen on the stones and on the photographs.

² *Am. Jour. Arch.* 1918, p. 182. The quarry is still to be seen in the Grotta Oscura region four kilometers north of Prima Porta not far from the Tiber.

in a region that lies between Rome and Falerii—may prove to be of importance not only in Etruscan but also in Italic philology, the attention of linguists ought perhaps to be called to these marks before they disappear.

In the first place it must be pointed out that these marks cannot be proved to be Latin letters. The normal open H and the square topped Γ are sometimes pointed to as indicating this, but Faliscan inscriptions have both of these forms (cf. for example C. I. E. 8256, 8343, 8240, 8340). It is also noteworthy that B D and O, which are lacking in Etruscan, do not appear on the blocks at Rome. To be sure, round letters are usually lacking on these blocks, but the triangular form of D and the square form of O are not unusual on early Italic inscriptions and might reasonably be expected if these marks were Roman. The most striking fact is that, while E occurs over twenty times, there is no certain case³ of the equally facile F. Since the Faliscans used ↑ for F it seems likely that the seventy or more instances of this character found on the "Servian" blocks should be read as F. The character may of course be the central Etruscan ↓ (= chi),⁴ but at any rate it is not a Roman letter.

Similarly, by the side of T we find the signs Y and V on these blocks at Rome. The T may be Latin or Etruscan, but the other two signs, while found in Faliscan inscriptions for T, have as yet not been found in Latin ones. In the case of the other characters that certainly occur on these stones (A C E I K L N V X I [= Z] and the ligatures A' and A) no valid conclusions can be drawn, since in the fourth century B. C. they were common to Rome and South Etruria.

The present excavations at Veii will probably produce some inscriptions, and new evidence may any day come to light at Rome. Meanwhile it would seem that Etruscologists might profitably make a reliable record of the characters still legible on the "Servian" blocks and show what connections they bear with the various alphabets of southern Etruria.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

TENNEY FRANK.

³ Bruzza reports two or three from the Palatine, but he probably misread the letter E. At least one finds in the letters still visible there traces of three horizontal lines.

⁴ Since the blocks are as wide as they are high, they were laid without reference to the direction of the writing.

V.—THE METRICAL ARRANGEMENT OF THE KOMMÓS IN THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

The very essence of the *κομμός*, viewed as a lamentation for the dead, is the dirge, *ὦ ὦ βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ κτλ.* (1489-1496), a series of five anapaestic lines followed by three lyric lines. This is impressively repeated (1513-1520) after an anapaestic stanza by Clytemnestra and a lyric stanza by the chorus. There is no doubt that this, which I shall call the *dirge proper*, is handled as a refrain in that portion of the *κομμός* where it occurs, the whole scheme here being orderly, inasmuch as it consists of the following:—(1) Strophe, 1481-1488; (2) Dirge Proper, 1489-1496; (3) Clytemnestra's Anapaests, 1497-1504; (4) Antistrophe, 1505-1512; (5) Dirge Proper, 1513-1520; (6) Clytemnestra's Anapaests, 1523-1529.

This complete metrical series (1481-1529) I conceive to be the central series, the kernel, of the *κομμός*. If one were to develop from this a series without repeated refrain, one would have:—(1) Strophe, (2) Equivalent to Dirge, (3) Anapaests, (4) Antistrophe, (5) Anapaests. This is exactly the arrangement in the two other portions of the *κομμός*. In other words the *κομμός* as a whole consists of an elaborate metrical series inset between two series, similar in character, but a little more simple. The whole scheme may be outlined thus:—

Series 1.

Chorus. Strophe α (7 lines) 1448-1454

Chorus. *ὦ ὦ παράνουσ Ἑλένα κτλ.*, Anapaests (4 lines) } 1455-
+ Lyric Verses (3 lines) } 1461

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (6 lines) 1462-1467

Chorus. Antistrophe α (7 lines) 1468-1474

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (6 lines) 1475-1480

Series 2 (The Inset Series).

Chorus. Strophe β (8 lines) 1481-1488

Chorus. *ὦ ὦ βασιλεῦ βασιλεῦ κτλ.*, Anapaests (5 lines) +
Lyric Verses (3 lines) 1489-1496

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (8 lines) 1497-1504

Chorus. Antistrophe β (8 lines) 1505-1512

Chorus. *ὦ ὦ κτλ.* (exact repetition) 1513-1520

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (8 lines) 1523-1530

Series 3.

Chorus. Strophe γ (7 lines) 1530-1536 ¹

Chorus. $\iota\omega\ \gamma\alpha\ \gamma\alpha$, $\epsilon\iota\theta'$ $\xi\mu'$ $\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$ κτλ., Anapaests (8 lines) +
Lyric Verses (3 lines) 1537-1550

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (9 lines) 1551-1559 ¹

Chorus. Antistrophe γ (7 lines) 1560-1566

Clytemnestra. Anapaests (11 lines) 1567-1576 ¹

It seems to me that the arrangement is one of peculiar poetic beauty, exquisitely suited in its orderly irregularity to the psychological pitch of this remarkable scene of passionate grandeur. The *dirge proper* sounds twice from the heart of the choric poem, its strains preluded by the similar $\iota\omega\ \iota\omega$ $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ 'Ελένα of the first series and echoed by the hoarse and despairing $\iota\omega\ \gamma\alpha\ \gamma\alpha$, $\epsilon\iota\theta'$ $\xi\mu'$ $\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$ of the choric anapaests of the third series. When the lines are thus conceived, there is not the urgent necessity which has harassed commentators to seek for exact responsions in the lyrics which complete these anapaestic systems. The formal strophe and antistrophe responsions in each series are exact, if one divide, as Goodwin does, the word $\delta\iota\phi\upsilon\iota\omicron\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ between lines 1468 and 1469 and add, following Butler and Enger, a word of two syllables to line 1474. It should be noted that Sidgwick and Goodwin follow Seidler in deleting, as clearly spurious, lines 1521-2. I have accepted their judgment in this matter, as the outline of my scheme indicates.

Series 3, as a composite, may, in a sense, be regarded as a free responsion to Series 1. I believe it may be interpreted metrically in musical terms as the recurrence of a theme with slight variations on the first treatment.

It is interesting to compare this *κομμός* with the elaborate *κομμός* of the same poet's *Choephoroi* (306 ff.), which, in its intricate responsions, is as delicately wrought as a sonnet of sonnets, being in metrical structure an astounding masterpiece. Not less beautiful, but more rugged, is this passage from the *Agamemnon*. I believe that editors who have mercilessly torn it to shreds in their critical despair at its irregular prosody might have profited by comparing it to the Erechtheum, that temple which does not conform to our accepted canons of Greek architecture.

FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON.

WALLA WALLA, WASHINGTON.

¹ There is a confusion in numbering these lines. See Sidgwick's text (Oxford, 1902) and Goodwin's (Cambridge, Mass., 1906).

VI.—A SUGGESTED EMENDATION FOR AESCHYLUS,
AGAMEMNON, LINE 1459.

The line occurs in a passage which editors “give up” as hopelessly corrupt, although the general sense of the context is apparent. My proposed emendation is of a single word, *πολύμναστον*. The context in full is:—

ἰὼ ἰὼ παράνουσ Ἑλένα
μία τὰς πολλὰς, τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς
ψυχὰς ὀλέσας ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ.
† νῦν δὲ τελείαν . . .
πολύμναστον ἐπηνθίσω δι’ αἷμ’ ἀνιπτον,
ἥτις ἦν τότε ἐν δόμοις
ἔρις ἐρίδματος ἀνδρὸς οἷζύς †.

The text is that of the Oxford edition (A. Sidgwick), 1902. The line which I am discussing, Mr. Sidgwick in his annotated edition of the play (Oxford, 1905) translates: ‘Thou hast put on thee as a flower a memorable stain of blood indelible.’ Following Hermann, he omits δι’ before αἷμ’.

My suggestion is that, in place of *πολύμναστον*, the adjective *πολυμνάσταν* (Epic *πολυμνήστην*) be read, as peculiarly applicable to Helen. Reading the line with the δι’ of the MSS and postulating a reflexive in the mutilated line or lines immediately preceding, we should have this sense: ‘Through blood indelible thou hast put on thee as a flower the name of the much-wooed,’ more literally, ‘Thou hast bedecked thyself, the much-wooed, (or, as the much-wooed) through blood indelible.’

The change is a slight one. Metrically the alteration is perhaps greater than verbally, but, since responsions are irregular or confused in the *κομμός* to which this passage belongs, the metrical test is impossible.

The reflexive with a middle verb is not unusual. (Cf. Thuc. 1, 33, ἡ κακῶσαι ἡμᾶς ἡ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βεβαιώσασθαι; Aeschin. 1, 132, κατασκοπούμενος ἑαυτόν. See Gildersleeve, Syntax of Class. Gk., 1900, § 153.

FLORENCE M. B. ANDERSON.

WALLA WALLA, WASHINGTON.

VII.—NOTES ON THE RĀUHIṆEYACARITRA.

The first edition of the Rāuhiṇeyacaritra, published at Jamnagar in 1908, is now out of print. This was the text from which I made the translation in the "Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield." There is a second edition, published by the Ātmānanda Sabhā at Bhavnagar in 1916. This follows very closely the first edition and seems to be a reprint, with a few corrections. My references are all to this second edition.

The Rāuhiṇeyacaritra seemed full of new material for the lexicons, but it was impossible to be certain until manuscripts were examined. I found two manuscripts in India and, through the courtesy of Dr. Thomas of the India Office, and of the library authorities in Berlin, was able to examine the one in the *koenigl. Bibliothek*. Apparently, none of these was the manuscript from which the original edition was made, but notwithstanding diligent search, I could find only two manuscripts in India; one in the Bhandarkar Institute for Oriental Research at Poona, and one in private hands in Bhavnagar, secured through the Ātmānanda Sabhā.

The Berlin MS is dated 1454 A. D. It is very well written with comparatively few clerical errors. It has an occasional survival of the archaic method of writing vowels, which is universal in the Poona MS. This one, therefore, must antedate 1454 A. D., and seems to be almost, if not quite, contemporaneous with the author, Devamūrti. The Jains could not give me his exact dates, but all agreed in attributing the date 1440 A. D. to his *Vikramacaritra*. The value given to the Poona MS by its age is decreased somewhat by the fact that it is very carelessly written and abounds in errors. The Bhavnagar MS is a late nineteenth century one, very accurate, but with few additional variants.

New and Rare Words in the Rāuhiṇeyacaritra.

4. *vanaspatyā bhārāṣṭādaṣasamkhyayā*, Marathi *aṭharā bhāra vanaspati*, 'a comprehensive term for the herbs and plants on the globe.' Molesworth and Candy, Marathi-English Dict. p. 14.
5. *ghūtkṛta* = *ghūtkāra*, onomatopoeic word. 8. *jāli* = *jāla*,

‘network.’ All the MSS and the first ed. read *vañṣajālī*°. 10. *parvati*, from *parb*, ‘go.’ 12. *pra-kṛ*, ‘collect.’ 13. *navadvāra*, slang for ‘breach in the wall.’ 15. *avasvāpinī* (doubtful form), = *avasvāpanī* (MSS reading), ‘sleeping position.’ 19. *viṣopaka* = *viñṣopaka*, a coin, the twentieth part of a rupee. 19. *dramaka*. I was told that *dramaka* = *dramma*, which is the reading of my MSS: P.¹ *drampa eko*; Bh *drama eko*; B *dramma eko*. 26. *guṇa* = *upāya*, ‘means.’ 35. *açāsīt*, aorist formation from *çās*. 38. *ghana*, ‘having hard rind.’ The ‘fruit with hard rind’ here = ‘cocoanut.’ 38. *arjunaketu*, ‘monkey.’ *ketu* = *dhvaja*, ‘banner.’ *arjunadhvaja* = epithet of Hanuman; *kapidhvaja* = epithet of Arjuna. 47. *uc-cal*, if read, must = simple *cal*. P and B read *nocālitam*. 59. *dharāpīṭha*, ‘earth.’ 84. *mūlikā kāṣṭhānām*, appears to be simply ‘bundle of wood.’ 86. *sthīyate*. I referred (R. C. p. 171) to its exceptional use. All three of my mss. read *prayojanam*, instead of *hi sthīyate*. 96. *rāsaka*, doubtful. I suggested (R. C. p. 172) ‘lamentations’ from *rās*, ‘to cry’; Dharma Suri suggested ‘wanderings’ from *ras*, ‘to dance.’ 99. The *āsana* of the first ed., which was such a difficult point (R. C. p. 172) has been solved by the MSS. P and B have *çāsana*; Bh *prāsana*. Second ed. *prāçana*. 101, 141. *dhavalagṛha*, ‘palace.’ 104, 127. *kāñḍiçika*, = *kāñḍiçika*, ‘fugitive.’ 113. *naṭ*, ‘play tricks on.’ So quoted by Apte. 115. *samavasaraṇa*, ‘assembly-hall,’ erected by the gods for a sage who has attained Kevala Jñāna. 122, 131. *prayojana*, ‘advice, command.’ 123. *nyuñchana* = Guj. *luñchana*, a form of showing honor by doubling up the hands and placing them on the temples. 126. *dharana*, ‘capture.’ 130. *daṇḍapāçika* = *daṇḍapāçaka*, ‘policeman.’ Throughout the text. Apte quotes both forms. 142. *vṛddhāyuvatī*, ‘old woman.’ 142. *ambikātva*, ‘the role of a mother.’ 148, 176, 313. *paṭṭakūla*, ‘fine cloth.’ 156, 157, 179, 324. *kṣātra* = *khātra*, ‘breach, tunnel.’ 157. *bībhatsate*, from *bādh*, ‘to tie.’ 162. *caturaka* = *caturikā*, *catuṣka*,

¹ Abbreviations:—P = MS in Bhandarkar Institute in Poona. Bh = MS in Bhavnagar. B = MS in the koenigl. Bibliothek in Berlin, MS. orient. fol. 775. *Pārçva*° = Bloomfield, *Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārçvanātha*. Hertel = Hertel, *Bharaṭakadvātrimśikā*, Leipzig, 1922.

‘court-yard.’ 173. mūrcha = Guj. mūcha, ‘moustache.’ mūrchayoḥ ca valaṁ kṣipan, ‘twirling the moustache.’ 174. caṭ, ‘falls.’ cf. Pārçva° p. 221 and Hertel, p. 53. 186. anṛṇībhāva, ‘freedom from debt.’ 194. dhomkāra, onomatopoeic, used of the sound of drums. 215. banda = bandin, ‘plunder.’ 219. bandagrāhin = bandigrāha, ‘thief.’ 224. cirbhata, ‘cucumber,’ as neuter. 244, 296. ḡrāddha, ‘a grade of Jain disciple.’ See Pārçva° p. 166. 245, 259. niṣedhikā. A Jain devotee says nissahī (in the vernacular) three times when he enters the temple. This is to drive away all worldly thoughts. The root is sidh, ‘to ward off.’ In Hemacandra’s Mahāvīracaritra, 142, the form naiṣedhakī occurs. 252. bhadra, ‘a grade of Jain disciple.’ Pārçva° p. 226. 258, 3. vi-naṭ = naṭ, ‘to play tricks on.’ 258. nr̥tya, ‘trick.’ 260. dakṣiṇā, doubtful. Does it = pradakṣiṇā, ‘deasil,’ or is it perhaps ‘punishment’ as one kind of ‘fee?’ 260. samavasṛti, ‘shrine.’ 264. tittara = tittira, ‘partridge.’ 266. paraṭā = Guj. paraḍā, pl. of paraḍo, ‘pod of the babbūla.’ 273. ghana = Guj. ghaṇu, ‘many.’ 287. doraka, ‘cord.’ 331. meṣa, ‘shutting of the eyes.’ 339. sumanasa = sumanas, ‘flower.’ 351. vārin (doubtful reading) = vāran, which P and B have. 364. chut, ‘escape.’ Cf. Pārçva° p. 232 and Hertel, p. 53. 367. nir-ṇī, ‘lead astray’ (?) P and B read vāhitah, ‘mystified,’ and nir-ṇīto must here have a similar meaning. 368. Çvetāmbī, name of a city. 373. Kāutukabhaṇḍāra, name of a forest. 380. stambhinī = stambhanī, ‘an arresting charm.’ 445. pr̥ṣṭi, ‘back.’ 467. pañcanamaskṛti, ‘salutation of the five spiritual dignitaries.’

HELEN JOHNSON.

VIII.—BANTU NOTES.

Aside from intrusive Semitic, there seem to be three main divisions of African languages: northern Hamitic, southern Bantu, and central Negritic or Sudanic. The Bantu languages are described as having a Hamitic-like basis combined with a Negritic vocabulary.¹ In dealing with these languages many special symbols are needed for exact transcriptions. Openness and closeness of vowel-quality are not indicated in the following notes; consonants requiring notice are η = English final *ng*; \tilde{n} = Spanish *ñ*; *c* = Hungarian *ty*; ζ = German *ch* in *echt*; x γ , velar fricatives; ϕ β , bilabial fricatives; k^p g^b , labiovelars with double stoppage, derived from k^w g^w . The small letter ω marks labiovelarized consonants, which occur also in Arabic.² A subscript dot indicates reverted linguals.

A well-known member of the Negritic group is Ewe (*eβe*), spoken in the region west of Nigeria. Ewe words apparently connected with Bantu equivalents are *eve* (2) = *bali*, *beli*, *bili*; *etō* (3) = *tatu*, *satu*; *ene* (4) = *na*, *ne*, *ena*, *ina*, *ine*, *nne*; *atō* (5) = *tano*, *sano*; *abo* (arm) = *boko*, *boxo*; $\phi u < x u < k u$ ³ (bone) = *fufa*, *fupa*, *kupa*; *to* (ear) = *to*, *tu*, *tui*; *ta* (head) = *twa*, *twe*, *to*; *koti* (neck) = *koti*, *kosi*; *ade* (tongue) = *leme*, *lemi*, *lime*, *limi*; *ku*, k^pe (stone) = *go*, g^bwe , *gwe*, *bwe*, *bye*; *ati* (tree) = *ti*, *te*; $si < t\check{s}i < ki$ ⁴ (water) = *ze*, *zi*, *ezi*, *dzi*, *nzi*, *dži*, ηge , ηgi .

Ewe *ade* (6) resembles *etō* (3); *adre* (7) seems to be a compound of *ade* and ηde (1); *eñi* (8) resembles *ene* (4). Evidently *ade* may have some such basis as **etet* (3 + 3), with *a* taken from *atō* (5); and *eñi* might have come from *ene ene* thru **enien*, **eñen*, **eñin*. Some of the Bantu tongues express 6 as 3 + 3, and 4 + 4 is widely used for 8 in Bantu *nana*, *nane*, *nani*, *ñañi*. Meinhof assumes that the basis of 4 is *na*.⁵ This theory

¹ Meinhof, *Introduction to the Study of African Languages*, p. 100 (London, 1915).

² Gairdner, *Egyptian Arabic*, p. 2 (Cambridge, 1917).

³ Westermann, *Die Sudansprachen*, p. 162 (Hamburg, 1911).

⁴ Westermann, *Die Sudansprachen*, p. 86.

⁵ Meinhof, *Lautlehre der Bantusprachen*, p. 240 (Berlin, 1910).

fails to explain the forms with *e* or *i* instead of *a*. I think it is better to assume **mina*, represented by *mi* in Negritic.⁶ In Bantu the *m* of **mina* has been changed to *w*, assimilated to *n*, or lost (as in Ewe *ene*): *wana*, *nna*, *ina*, *ena*, *na*. The first vowel is assimilated to the second in *wana*; otherwise it has often palatalized the second vowel, and sometimes changed *n* to *ñ*: *nne*, *ine*, *ne*, *nni*, *ini*, *ni*, *ña*, *ñe*, *ñi*.

Meinhof assumes **müa*, with mediopalatal *ü*, as the root of Bantu *nwa*, *ñwa*, *ño*⁷ (drink). Westermann assumes **nü*, with mediopalatal *ü*, as the basis of Negritic *ano*, *enu*, *nu*, *inua*, *ña*⁸ (mouth). I agree with Johnston in holding that the theory of mediopalatal *ü* (= Norwegian *u*) and *ï* (= Rumanian *î*), considered as essential elements of early African speech, is not at all reasonable.⁹ If we compare these Negritic words with the Bantu equivalents, *ana*, *ano*, *ena*, *na*, *no*, *nu*, *nuo*, *nua*, *nwa*, *mwa*, *ña*, *ño*, *ñu*, *ñua*, *ñwa*, and with the Bantu verbs just mentioned, it seems clear that their common basis is represented by *inua*, or by *inwa*, a Semi-Bantu form of the noun recorded by Johnston. The initial vowel has been assimilated to or towards the final *a*, in *ana*, *ano*, *ena*. A change of *nw* thru *n^w* to *n* is probably implied by *ana*, *ena*, *na*. The *m* of *mwa* may have come from *n^w*, formed without loss of the following *w*; or it may be derived from the influence of *lomo* (lip), which has become *omo* in some of the Bantu languages. The forms with *ñ* show the alterant power of *i* before a dental, in accordance with *ña* = *ina* (4). Herero *omu-na* (lip) and *ocçi-ño* (mouth) seem to contain two derivatives of the *nwa*-form: *na* < **n^wa* after *u*, and *ño* < *ñwa* after *i*. A few languages treat as radical the prefix of *ka-nwa*: *di-kanu*, *li-kano*, *ndi-kanwa*. The form *ka-mia* may represent **ima* < **in^wa*; *m-ia* may be the same form, with *m* treated as a prefix.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

⁶ Westermann, *Die Sudansprachen*, p. 114.

⁷ Meinhof, *Lautlehre*, p. 239.

⁸ Westermann, *Die Sudansprachen*, p. 170.

⁹ Johnston, *Bantu and Semi-Bantu Languages*, p. 37 (Oxford, 1919).

REPORTS.

HERMES LVII (1922), parts 3 and 4.

Aphoristische Bemerkungen zu den Ekklesiazusen des Aristophanes (321-356). † C. Robert secures a more telling effect in numerous passages by a better assignment of lines among the speakers. He deals also with textual questions, and, among other interesting suggestions, gives his reasons for believing that the plot of the *Ecclesiazusae* rests on communistic ideas which Plato had expressed to A. in friendly intercourse, which A. combined with the conception of female rule as treated in the *Lysistrata*.

Philologische Kleinigkeiten (357-365). R. Reitzenstein thinks that Horace in ode II 13 pictures the blessed state of poets of former ages, suggesting a similar lot for himself; then, proceeding from the structure of this poem, R. interprets Horace's ode I 22 and Catullus XI with especial reference to their supposed humor.

ΙΩ ΚΑΛΛΙΘΥΕΣΣΑ (366-374). F. Jacoby supports by means of literary testimony, against C. Robert (cf. A. J. P. XLIII 274), the belief in the existence of an ancient Hera cult at Tiryns. *Καλλίθυια* was originally a distinct personage.

Perikles Samische Leichenrede (375-395). Leo Weber substantiates the supposition of Ed. Meyer (*Forschungen* II 219 ff.) that Herod. VII 161 and IX 27 depended on the funeral oration delivered by Pericles in honor of those who fell in the Samian war 439 B. C. Accordingly this type of oration was established long before the time of Gorgias' influence. The contents and structure of the Samian oration can be determined from Herodotus, Plato's *Menexenos* 237 b-239 d, Plut. *Pericl.* 8 etc. Further, a comparison of the reconstructed Samian oration with the famous funeral oration of Pericles, shows that, with due allowance for Thucydides' style, we can accept the latter no less as an historical document than the Samian speech. The changed times at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war account for the difference between the two orations. Two excursuses follow. In I, he discusses the influence of the *Epitaphii* on the Persian speeches in Herod. III 80 ff.; in II, the Tegean speech in Herod. IX 26, which probably rests on local traditions.

Der Verfasser des *Anonymus Londinensis* (396-429). Max Wellmann gives the history of the Methodic School of medicine from its foundation by Themison of Laodicea at the end of the Roman republic. He finds a close agreement of the *Anonymus*

L. (cf. *Hermes* 28, 407 ff.) with the late Methodic School, and concludes that this document is a fragment of the *Εἰσαγωγή* of Soranus of Ephesus, the only one of this school that was recognized by Galen.

Kleine Studien zur Marinegeschichte des Altertums (430-449). F. Graefe in this article (cf. *Hermes* LII (1917) 317 ff. LIV (1919) 219 and A. J. P. XLI 90 Misc.) cites passages from Thucydides, Polybius, Caesar, Livy, etc., which give accounts of how the ancients attacked hostile fleets or fortifications with burning ships, or flaming baskets, suspended on poles at the prow. The modern Greeks call the fire ship *μπουρλότον* (from French brûlot), which they used in 1821/29 with telling effect against the Turks. In the same way he shows how harbors were protected by means of chains, rafts, sunken ships etc. The sunken ship has been successfully employed as a means of defense in modern times; but when the attacking party tries to 'bottle up' the enemy in his harbor, it has met only with partial success or none at all, as at Santiago de Cuba (June 3, 1898) and at Port Arthur (1904). It is, therefore, interesting that only in one passage (Livy XXXVII 14 and 15) this device was proposed, but rejected.

Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung des Hyperides-Textes (450-464). O. J. Schröder restores gaps in speeches 1, 5 and 6 of Jensen's excellent edition of Hyperides (1917).

Zu Demosthenes (465-471). K. Münscher discusses the text of [Dem.] XLIV, [Dem.] LVIII and Dem. LVII and again objects to Thalheim's views.

Miscellen: Stephan Brassloff (472-475) discusses the papyrus Halensis I 219 ff. according to which an Alexandrian might not be the slave of another Alexandrian; hence there were not two classes of Alexandrians. This furnishes an interesting parallel to the Roman law that a person who voluntarily yielded his liberty was to be sold trans Tiberim. Tacitus, Germ. 24, and the Mosaic code are also discussed. Although the papyrus does not expressly state that an Alexandrian woman may not have a male slave, this was probably prohibited, as it was in Palestine.—J. J. E. Hondius (475-477) calls attention to a new inscription: *ἡῖπαρχος ἀνέθε[κεν] ἡο πεισιω[τράτο]* (Corr. Hell. XLIV (1920) 238) and concludes that both brothers shared the government (cf. *Αθ. π.* 18, 1), but that Hippias had the main government in his hands. However, we must wait for further inscriptions to decide this question (cf. A. J. P. XLIII 272).—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen (477-478) presents the restoration of an inscription by an Alcmeonid (Corr. Hell. XLIV (1920) 228 f.), which assists in restoring a similar inscription from Athens (Lolling-Wolters, *Καταλ. Ἐπιγρ. Μουσ.* 37, 13). These dedications were

probably intended to rival those of the Peisistratidae.—O. Weinreich (479-480) cites the first excerpt of Photius from Book VII of Ptolemy Chennos, which states that when Zeus was born, the babe laughed unceasingly for seven days. According to the prevailing myth the child cried. Ptolemy was a Peripatetic, which perhaps accounts for his juggling with the number seven (cf. Verg. ecl. IV 60 ff.).

Nikostratos der Platoniker (481-517). K. Praechter extracts important data for the history of Greek philosophy from the new revision of Dittenberger's sylloge (II³ No. 868), where three Delphic decrees confer citizenship etc. on certain Platonic philosophers, including L. Calvenus Taurus of Berytus, Baccheius, adoptive son of Gaius, Gaius himself, and an Athenian Nicostratus. Taurus' name is thus established (cf. Calvisius Taurus in Gellius XVIII 10, 3), and his relatively orthodox and religious attitude emphasized by this recognition on the part of the Delphic priesthood. This applies also to Baccheius, who is, moreover, associated with Gaius, whose religious Platonism is known. Zeller (Phil. d. Gr. III 1⁴ 715) classified Baccheius as a Stoic; but we see that he, like other teachers of Marcus Aurelius, was a Platonist. Finally, this Nicostratus can be identified with the Nicostratus whom Simplicius frequently mentions. Zeller, indeed, classified the latter as a Stoic, but Praechter shows that he was a Platonist from Athens and flourished c. 160-170 A. D., which agrees with the dates of the inscription. II. Praechter gives a documentary account of Nicostratus' relation to the Middle and New Platonism, and shows the existence of a twofold attitude of the Platonic school toward the categories of Aristotle: one line of eclectics, beginning with Antiochus of Ascalon, endeavored to harmonize Plato and Aristotle; it passed by Plotinus, but included Porphyrius and continued throughout neo-Platonism. The other line, rooted in the scepticism of the New Academy, held a negative attitude, whose criticism of the categories did much to improve the science of dialectics. This orthodox school included Lucius, Nicostratus, Atticus, and ended with Plotinus.

Die neuen Urkunden von Epidaurus (518-534). H. Swoboda contributes observations on the inscriptions discovered by Kavvadias during his excavations at Epidaurus 1916-1918, and published in *'Αρχαιολογική Ἐφημερίς* 1918, τ 4. 115 ff. No. 1 (pp. 116 ff.) refers to a treaty between Epidaurus and Rome 111 or 112 B. C. No. 2 (pp. 124 ff.) is more important, since it contains a list of *Νομογράφοι* of the Achaean league, one from each of twelve cities, from others as many as two or three, which may be due to the recognition of larger populations. No. 3 (pp. 128 ff.) yields important data concerning the Hellenic league of

Antigonus Doson, which S. discusses. Kavvadias, not being familiar with an extensive literature, which S. cites, thinks that No. 3 also dealt with the Achaean league.

Opferspenden (535-550). P. Stengel, in answer to Eitrem's criticism (Beiträge zur gr. Religionsgesch. III, Kristiania, 1920), shows that *χέρνυψ* and *χερνίπτεσθαι* did not apply to washing the hands at sacred rites, but always to libations sprinkled with the hand, and belonged to the *κατάρχεσθαι* together with *προβάλλεσθαι οὐλοχύτας*. He interprets especially Arist. Pax 961 (960) in this sense in opposition to Eitrem. Likewise *λουτρά* applies to libations; bathing and washing hands were not part of the funeral ritual, as Eitrem thinks. He also discusses the obscure meaning of the *λουτροφόροι* on graves. Thereupon S. examines the meaning of *ἄσπονδοι θυσίαι* (schol. Soph. Oed. Col. 100), and concludes that although such offerings are not mentioned in the lists of extant inscriptions, we must accept the scholiast's statement.

Die Schrift des Gorgias "Über die Natur oder über das Nichtseiende" (551-562). W. Nestle interprets the three theses of Gorgias so as to show that their purpose was to reduce the doctrine of Parmenides to an absurdity, and supposes it to be probable that with this 'skit' Gorgias in his youth turned from philosophy to rhetoric. Moreover, N. argues plausibly to show Zeno's defense of Parmenides *πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας αὐτὸν κωμῶδειν* (Plat. Parm. 128 C) may have been aimed at Gorgias, whose satire could easily have antedated Zeno's defense.

Vergil's Sechste Ekloge und die Ciris (563-587). K. Witte agrees in the main with Vollmer's interpretation of Verg. Ecl. VI (Rh. M. LXI [1906] 487). Vergil had promised to celebrate Varus' deeds in an epic poem (Ecl. IX 27-29), but in Ecl. VI he tells him that in obedience to Apollo he would confine himself to bucolic songs. Silenus is introduced to point out the wealth of this material. The Gallus song, introduced to honor him, is the only finished poem to which allusion is made. The Scylla myth is merely material. The Ciris poet criticizes Vergil's conception. The Enicurean theme (31-40) was of especial interest to Vergil (cf. Georg. II 475 ff.), as well as the Pasiphaë story (45-60), and as the former shows the influence of Lucretius, so the latter may have drawn on the Io of Calvus. All the other songs of Silenus can be explained from the text of Theocritus and commentaries on it. This interpretation of the poem shows its unity as a dedication to Varus. II. W. shows that the Ciris depends on Vergil, not only for numerous words, phrases and passages, but also for its structure.

Zur Ciris (588-599). A. Klotz shows the mechanical way in which the poet of the Ciris utilized Vergil's poetry, which

explains certain obscurities, some of which have been ascribed to lacunae. He also shows the probable dependence of this poet on Ovid. If this is so, then nearly all of the spondaic lines can be traced to classic models, which were utilized when the epyllion was antiquated, and poets were no longer facile in constructing them. The *Ciris* would suit the time of Tiberius, who, as Suetonius says (Tib. 70, 2), *fecit et Graeca poemata imitatus Euphorionem et Rhianum et Parthenium*.

Horazens 16. Epode und Vergils Bukolika (600-612). J. Kroll defends Skutsch's thesis that Vergil's fourth Eclogue depends on the 16. Epode of Horace (cf. *Neue Jhrb.* XXIII [1909] 28 ff. = *Kl. Schriften* 370 ff.) against Witte (*Philol. Wochensch.* XLI [1921] 1095 ff.). Kroll has shown Vergil's dependence on Horace in *Ecl.* I (cf. *A. J. P.* XXXIX 426 Misc.).

Die Urkunden von 411 (613-620). V. Ehrenberg shows the essential agreement of *Arist. Ath. pol.* 29, 5 with *Thuc.* VIII 65, 3; the usual comparison with *Thuc.* VIII 67, 3 shows mainly differences. He further compares *Arist. Ath. pol.* 31 with *Thuc.* VIII 67, 3, and concludes that Aristotle's description of the constitution of the 400 was derived from a document which was composed in order to justify the policy of the oligarchs. This purpose is especially evident in claiming as their plan (*Aristotle ch. 30*) the constitution of Theramenes 411/10. (Cf. *A. J. P.* XXXIX 216).

Miscellen: J. Hasebroek (621-623) calls attention to a *πύργος* in [Dem.] 47, 49 ff., which was evidently not a tower, but an industrial building adjoining the *οικία* and *αὐλή* (cf. *A. J. P.* XLI 387, XLII 345 Misc., and XLIII 273 Misc.), which is thus shown to have already existed in the IV century B. C.—A. Kurfess (623-625) approves of Münzer's interpretation of Cicero's Fannius letter (cf. *A. J. P.* XLIII 275), but holds against Münzer that *scripsi* (= *ad te scripsi*) is correct; in contrast *scripseram* refers to *Cic. Brutus* 100 ff.—F. Bechtel (625-626) explains *Umbr. parsest* (VII b. 2) as a present tense. The following sentence has the present *hertei*. *Pars est* like *mersest* point to the old *Umbr. řs.*—W. Morel (626-627) emends *Aesch. Agam.* 1252: *ἡ κάρτ' <ἐν>αρ<γ>ῶν παρεκόπης χρησμῶν ἐμῶν*, which he bases on Wilamowitz's text, with a suggestion from *Aesch. Prom.* 662.—The editor (627) states that the ms. of *Die Neuen Urkunden von Epidauros* (see above) was received at the end of May, 1922, before the publication of U. Wilcken's *Über eine Inschrift aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*, *Sitz.-Ber. Akad. Berlin* 1922, pp. 122 ff., and S. B. Koujeas' *Κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατ' ἐπιγραφὴν Ἐπιδαύρου, Ἀρχαιολ. Ἐφημερίς*, 1921, pp. 1-51, dated Aug. 21, 1922.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLVIII, Nos. 3 and 4.

Pp. 321-334. Alexandre Rosetti, Les catéchismes roumains du XVI^e siècle. Fragmentary remains of various catechisms in the Roumanian language prove that Martin Luther's catechism was introduced into that country shortly after its original publication in Germany. In October, 1921, a manuscript was discovered in a Balkan village, which contained two printed fragments. The endeavor to identify these waifs has led the author of the present article to investigate the whole subject of early Roumanian catechisms.

Pp. 335-364. C. Brunel, Les premiers exemples de l'emploi du provençal dans les chartes. In southern Europe the notarial scribes first employed the vulgar tongue in the midst of Latin phrases when their ignorance did not enable them otherwise to express their thoughts. This state of affairs existed about the year 1000 A. D., and hence it was at this time that Provençal phrases first appeared in the charts of various localities, beginning with those situated in remote mountainous sections and gradually spreading to those on the main thoroughfares of travel. The subject is one of vast extent, and it will necessarily be many years before it can be adequately controlled in all its parts.

Pp. 365-402. Holger Petersen, Trois versions inédites de la *Vie de Saint Eustache* en vers français. M. Paul Meyer enumerated eleven versions in 1906, four of which have since been published, and to them the present editor adds three more; namely, those of Cheltenham, York and Brussels. The present instalment of his article contains a critical edition of the first of these, together with an introduction treating largely of the form of speech used by the poet.

Pp. 403-418. Albert Dauzat, Notes argotiques. The origin of the word Argot itself is here shown to have been Germanic, and it is proven to have been first used in Provençal, whence it later spread to northern France. This article is divided into three sections as follows: I. Etymologies; II. Formation du pronom personnel périphrastique; III. Interprétations et conjectures diverses (Ballades argotiques de Villon).

Pp. 419-436. Mélanges:—Paul Marchot, *Hastula* et * *Hasta*, "Asphodèle."—Adolphe Horning, Paul Marchot, Daru.—H. Yvon, Sur l'emploi du futur antérieur (futurum exactum) au lieu du passé composé (passé indéfini).—J. Morawski, Fragment d'un *Art d'aimer* perdu du XIII^e siècle.

Pp. 437-443. Discussions:—Louis Gauchat, A propos de Apis en valais.

Pp. 444-457. Comptes rendus:—J. Anglade, Grammaire de

l'ancien provençal ou ancienne langue d'oc (A. Jeanroy).—J. Désormeaux, 1. Notes lexicographiques (J. Jud).—Angelica Hoffmann, Robert de le Piere, Robert le Clerc, Robert de Castel (Arthur Långfors).—Cinquantenaire de l'Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes, etc. (M. Roques).

Pp. 458-470. Périodiques.

Pp. 471-480. Chronique.

Pp. 481-558. J. Morawski, Les recueils d'anciens proverbes français analysés et classés. The author of this article intends to edit all the hitherto unpublished collections of Old French proverbs, and also an alphabetical list of all French proverbs prior to the fifteenth century. Some of the results of his investigations are herewith presented in this very long article. The twenty-five collections he has examined contain a trifle more than 2000 different proverbs, but it is evident that many others were also current in France in the Middle Ages, as numerous references are found in the literature of the period whose counterparts are not included in any of the collections studied. The greatest variety in the mode of treating proverbs is to be found in the various collections. Many of them cite Latin parallels, sometimes taken from the Bible; many give evidence of being mere schoolboy exercises, many give legal citations, many have profane explanations. It is evident, in short, that Mediaeval French proverbs offer a wide field of investigation to the modern scholar.

Pp. 559-570. Kr. Nyrop, Gueules, histoire d'un mot. I. Origine latine ou orientale? II. Etymologie et homonymie. III. Sens primitif de gueules. IV. Emploi héraldique. V. Pérégrinations de gueules. A supposed Oriental origin of this word is rejected, although this etymology was currently accepted for centuries; the true origin of the word is certainly Western and appears to refer to bits of fur sewed on the borders of mediaeval cloaks.

Pp. 571-584. Noël Dupire, *Le Mystère de la Passion de Valenciennes*. No serious attempt has hitherto been made to determine the authorship of this long play, but now it appears to have been the work of the well-known fifteenth-century poet Jean Molinet.

Pp. 585-598. Mélanges:—Ernest Langlois, Ongier.—S. Etienne, Note sur les vers 279-287 du *Jeu d'Adam*.—Max Prinnet, Sur le nom de rase de Brunehamel.

Pp. 599-606. Comptes rendus:—J. Jud, Zur Geschichte der bündnerromanischen Kirchensprache (M. R.).—A. Kolsen, I. Dichtungen der Trobadors auf Grund altprovenzalischer Handschriften teils zum ersten Male kritisch herausgegeben, teils be-

richtigt und ergaenzt; II. Zwei provenzalische Sircentese, nebst einer Anzahl Einzelstrophen (A. Jeanroy).—Kenneth McKenzie and William Oldfather, *Ysopet-Avionet: the Latin and French texts* (A. Jeanroy: "La classification des mss. a été . . . l'objet de longs développements . . . , mais elle est uniquement fondée sur les textes latins; elle devait être contrôlée par l'étude des textes français, sur la valeur relative desquels . . . les éditeurs paraissent avoir des idées assez vagues" ; and M. R.: "Il aurait beaucoup à rectifier encore dans l'accentuation qui fausse le sens . . . ou altère les formes; l'usage du tréma est très irrégulier; l'absence de guillemets rend assez pénible l'intelligence de bien des dialogues déjà obscurcies par les erreurs de ponctuation.")

Pp. 607-621. Périodiques.

Pp. 622-632. Chronique.

P. 632. Errata.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

REVIEWS.

Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art. By WALTER WOODBURN HYDE. Published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington: Washington, 1921. Pp. xix, 406; 2 Plans, 30 Plates, 80 Figures in the Text. \$10.50.

Olympia, "mother of contests," is one of the most interesting places in Greece whether regarded from the point of view of history, of topography, of archæology or of art. The excavations, ably conducted by German archæologists, were most fruitful in their results, and among other achievements gave a new birth to several masterpieces of sculpture that quickly acquired world-wide repute. The progress of the excavation of all ancient sites is marked by the proportionate increase of problems of identification and association of the fragmentary remains with the topographical reports or occasional references preserved to us by the Greek and Roman writers, or recorded in ancient inscriptions. Fortunately in the case of Olympia Pausanias has given a detailed account of the precinct and its monuments as they appeared in the second century A. D. But a guide-book, however thorough, is never exhaustive, and Pausanias in his peregrinations invariably omits as much or more than he mentions. The purpose of the present book is to study the extant remains at Olympia in the light of the

records of Pausanias and others, and to improve the present state of our knowledge of Olympic monuments by the interpretation and co-ordination of archæological and literary evidence.

For some years Professor HYDE has been studying problems dealing with the offerings at Olympia and consequently this elaborate book rests on the basis of a thorough knowledge of the Altis and its dedications. It is a critical and interpretative work such as is too rarely produced by American students and is, indeed, a monument of profound archæological scholarship in America.

The work opens with a preliminary chapter on "early Greek games and prizes" in which are briefly presented the facts bearing on the origin and development of athletic contests. From Cretan representations of pugilists and bull-fights we pass to accounts in Homer of athletic games held as part of the funeral services of the distinguished dead, and thence to a discussion of the thesis that the four great national games of Greece were funerary in origin. By a process of natural development grew the custom of the dedication by victors of the offerings in honor of their victory, and the study of these dedications is more profitable at Olympia than elsewhere because of the extensive remains uncovered by the excavators.

Chapter II, therefore, inaugurates the main topic of the book with a detailed statement of the "general characteristics of victor statues at Olympia." The available evidence is cited to show that in general the statues were life-size, and that most of them were nude. An interesting section here is concerned with the statement of Pliny that a threefold victor at Olympia had the privilege of erecting a portrait statue. But whatever may be the value of Pliny's observation the fact is emphasized that we have no evidence for the existence of realistic portraiture before the beginning of the fourth century B. C. Consequently, with a few possible exceptions, the victor statues were made after the pattern of ideal types, and inevitably these types must approximate the attributes associated with various deities. As man conceives himself made in the image of god idealized man can never differ much in appearance from humanized god, and we have before us the difficult but fascinating problem of the assimilation of victor statues to types of gods and heroes. In this connection our author plausibly suggests the interpretation as assimilated victor statues of several monuments regarded as representations of gods. In the type of Hermes, for example, are the bronze youth found in the sea near Antikythera and the "Jason" of the Louvre; in the type of Apollo, rather than Apollo himself, is perhaps "Apollo-on-the-omphalos" in Athens, and numerous works approximate

the type of Herakles who was reputed the founder of the Olympic games and the athlete *par excellence*.

In chapters III, IV and V the statues are classified according to the motives variously represented. After a brief review of the characteristics of the products of four great schools of sculpture at Argos, Sikyon, Aegina and Athens, statues at rest are discussed in subsections arranged with reference to the motive suggested. Statues are classified as engaged in adoration and prayer, in the process of anointing their bodies or of scraping them with oil, as pouring libations or simply as resting after the contest. Statues in motion include representations of all the gymnastic and athletic activities. The division of the statues into the two main groups of those at rest and those in motion is, of course, purely arbitrary, but for purposes of classification it serves quite as well as any other method of grouping.

The most interesting and important material in the book is presented in chapter VI which is largely a repetition of articles previously published in the *American Journal of Archaeology*. Professor HYDE has made a notable contribution to archæological science by his careful study of the characteristics of the style of Lysippos in connection with his identification of a superb marble head found at Olympia as the Philandridas of Lysippos. The head, a photograph of which is admirably reproduced as the frontispiece of the book, is similar in many respects to the head of Agias at Delphi, and HYDE presents strong arguments in favor of associating both with Lysippos. In support, then, of the contention that a marble work is an original from the hand of Lysippos there is considerable discussion both of the materials in which Lysippos worked and of the materials of the monuments dedicated at Olympia. In this connection a photograph is reproduced of a stone statue at Phigaleia which is identified by HYDE as the Olympic victor Arrhachion, and is regarded by him as one of the earliest victor monuments known. This statue of Arrhachion was seen by Pausanias at Phigaleia and may still be seen in the guards' house there.

The book concludes with a study of the positions of the victor statues in the Altis, in connection with which plans are given showing the Altis in the Greek and in the Roman periods. There is also a list of the victor monuments that were erected outside Olympia, and an adequate index is appended.

This ambitious work, which is published under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, is satisfactorily printed on good paper, and is profusely illustrated with well-reproduced figures and plates. It is, therefore, the more regrettable that it contains so many typographical errors and misprints. Minor mistakes, however unavoidable, are always

unfortunate, but even more distressing is the misspelling of the names of distinguished scholars like Loeschke and Poulsen, while perhaps most embarrassing of all blemishes is the confusion of the sex of a leading commentator on Pliny.

T. LESLIE SHEAR.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

A Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger:
A Study of Six Leaves of an Uncial Manuscript preserved
in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. By E. A.
LOWE and E. K. RAND. Published by the Carnegie Insti-
tution of Washington: Washington, 1922. Quarto. Pp.
67; 20 plates.

Classical philology is full of romantic discoveries. Our age will hardly witness a Poggio's exciting journey through neglected convent libraries, with its wealth of treasure-trove, nor will mankind soon stop warfare long enough to explore Herculaneum's book-collections; but on a lesser scale wonders are never ceasing, nor must we seek the Nile for all of them. In 1910, Pierpont Morgan bought from a Roman dealer six ancient uncial leaves, which lay peacefully in his magnificent New York library till 1915, when LOWE and RAND had the thrill of identifying them as a fragment of by far the oldest known MS of Pliny's Letters. Beginning with *cessit ut* (Plin. Ep. II. 20, 13), we have the rest of Book II, the table of contents of Book III, and Book III itself up to *viginti quibus* (III. 5, 4). One leaf bears an entry indicating that the MS was in Meaux, near Paris, about 1400; there is no other external evidence of the MS's origin or vicissitudes. The Carnegie Institution has generously furthered their publication on a scale now impossible in Europe; and with Merrill's new Teubner edition of the Letters (1922), we have an unusual chance to make and test critical deductions. Excellent facsimiles of the whole fragment allow us to check every statement; plates of B and F are added, as well as of Budaeus' corrected copy of Beroaldus' edition, and specimens of early uncial.

To LOWE falls the paleographical discussion. After a most careful and competent description of the twelve pages, he attempts the dating and location of the handsome uncial, with remarkably correct spelling, in which they are written. As always, he gives us a wealth of incidental erudition, here tabulated for the first time; witness the valuable notes on syllabication, and the list of dated uncial MSS (371-787 A. D.).

Here he accepts the traditional date of 371 for the Codex Vercellensis; the other oldest dated uncials would be the earlier part of Jerome's Chronicon of Eusebius (after 442), in the Bodleian, and the Berlin Computus Paschalis (about 447). I should add the Ambrosian MS of Gregory's Dialogues (about 750) to the list. After a valuable and illuminating presentation of the characteristics of the earliest uncials, he comes to the tentative conclusion that our MS (II) was written in Italy about 500 A. D.

Aldus, in his 1508 edition of the Letters—the first to contain the whole text—tells us that he used an ancient MS brought him from Paris. RAND's earnest and ingenious effort is to prove that our fragment is a part of this very MS (P). Before Aldus' day, P had been used by Budaëus to correct and amplify his copy of Beroaldus' edition, and this volume is still extant, in the Bodleian. RAND notes the close agreement of II with B and F (Laurentian MSS, doubtless written in France in the ninth and tenth centuries respectively), and tries to show that BF are derived from II, with probably a copy intervening. He finds (p. 50) 3 cases in our brief fragment where II and BF differ: *conferenda* BF *conferenda* II; *comprobasse* BF *comprovasse* II; *si imbutus* BF *sibi imbutus* II. I grant that an intelligent Carolingian corrector might make the first two changes; I find the third a bit hard, and would guess, like Merrill, that II is a copy of the progenitor of BF.

Although lacking access to several of the earliest editions, RAND attacks with great erudition the problem of Aldus' sources and his way of using them, and concludes with "a new confidence in the integrity of Aldus." In a foot-note to p. 37, he acknowledges Prof. E. T. Merrill's aid, and remarks: "Professor Merrill should not be held responsible for errors that remain or for my estimate of the Morgan fragment." *Praesaga verba!* Merrill's searching critique of our book in C. P. XVIII 97-119 certainly leaves us under no illusion on this score. With pitiless acumen, Merrill pounces on every incautious statement of our authors. LOWE's attribution of the MS to Italy is shown to be risky, through lack of evidence; and his dating of the MS within half a century is impugned for the same reason. But Merrill's heaviest calibre is reserved for RAND. Space fails us to recapitulate his arguments; but he emphasizes what RAND in his enthusiasm occasionally forgets, that the identification of II with the Parisinus is only an attractive hypothesis, since the fragment is too brief to furnish anything of the nature of stringent proof. RAND had also tried to show that Aldus followed II closely; Merrill recalls that Aldus had other MSS at command, among them very likely one of the copies of F, with a text like P (II). And yet Merrill's final paragraph, though

somewhat Delphic, implies that he too would like to identify our fragment with the lost Parisinus; certainly there is nothing to make that identification impossible.

The beginner in text criticism will do well to collate our fragment (from the plates) with Merrill's text, and study his introduction; then work carefully through RAND's essay and Merrill's review. He will have an admirable introduction to a typical problem of the science. We understand RAND has been making further studies of the early editions; perhaps we shall eventually have here classic material for a seminar on critical method (if any yet there be who worship at that shrine). Meanwhile let us congratulate the authors on their scholarly and most readable publication, which evidently represents many weary months of research, and thank the Morgan Library and the Carnegie Institution for their sumptuous gift to the classical student and the paleographer.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

NORTH HATLEY, QUEBEC.

P. Vergili Maronis Opera, recognovit G. Janell, editio maior, B. G. Teubner, 1920.

Vergil has long been unfortunate in his editors. Ribbeck's large edition, which we must still use for its full readings, was sadly marred by arbitrary transpositions and deletions, an overestimate of the value of the MS R and even of P, and a curious theory regarding cursive sources. Conington's uninspired comments, Henry's erratic dialectic, and Norden's vast accumulation of fanciful parallels have not brought us very close to the poet. Warde Fowler, who revealed a remarkable insight into Vergil's manner, approached his task late in life and left us precious fragments of a torso.

When Teubner promised a new text of Vergil, we hoped at least for a definitive edition, but it seems that the exigencies of the great war prevented the making of a new collation. Dr. Janell, the editor, has apparently contented himself with re-examining the photograph of F, and adopted old collations for the rest. His apparatus differs from that of the Ribbeck Teubner and the Oxford text of Hirtzel mainly in giving less attention to the minuscule MSS, and somewhat more to the readings of the scholiasts and grammarians, adding lemmata especially from the now accessible Claudius Donatus.

A few text readings may be cited by way of illustrating his tendencies. Janell takes no notice whatsoever of the prefatory four lines of the Aeneid which Donatus and Servius found in

early testimonia. In view of his general faith in early comments his decision in this case seems to me inconsistent. Even if we hesitate to follow the Oxford text in accepting them, we do at least expect to see them noticed in the apparatus. He also fails to refer to the reading *tempore* (I, 44) which Dan. Servius says that Probus read. At I, 427, he fails to report that P has *theatris* corrected to *theatri*, yet on the strength of M and Servius reads the latter. At I, 441, he attributes *umbræ* to *Serv. in lemm.*; whereas the lemma gives *umbra*, citing Probus for *umbræ*. Janell brackets the Helena episode of II, 567 ff., referring to the well-known discussions of Leo, Heinze and Norden. Here it would have been far more logical to follow Sabbadini, who prints the lines in italics with the remark: *Hos versus vere Vergilianos puto a poeta ipso deletos*. In III, 127, where Hirtzel boldly accepts Bentley's *consita* contrary to the text of M, F, P and Servius, Janell rightly retains *concita*. At VI, 96 he rightly follows the MSS in reading *quam* (well defended by Norden), where most recent editions have been misled by Seneca's MSS into accepting *qua*. At VI, 177 he rejects the usually accepted reading of P in favor of M. Misprints are numerous.

From these typical instances it will be seen that Janell is not always reliable in his reports, that he very conservatively follows the MSS (preferring M to P), and that he makes very little use of the scholia and lemmata that he has packed into his apparatus. It is difficult to see in what respect he has justified a new edition.

The introduction contains the *vitæ* of Donatus, Servius and Probus, and three pages of testimonia. There is also an Index Nominum but the edition departs from the Ribbeck Teubner in omitting the Appendix Vergiliana.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Virgil's Biographia Litteraria. By N. W. DEWITT. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. viii + 192 pp. \$4.20.

This is mainly a study of the poems of the minor Virgilian corpus. Beginning with a laudable respect for tradition, Professor DEWITT has convinced himself that all the poems of the group, save the anachronistic Elegiae in Maecenatem, stand or fall together. He even suggests that Virgil preserved them as his autobiography, and resolutely attempts to find a place for each of them in the poet's career.

The *Culex* is referred to Virgil's 17th year—written at Rome, though it really belongs to his Transpadane period. The *Moretum*, the *Copa*, the *Priapeans* and the *Ciris* are all referred to one short year at Naples, beginning with the spring of 45. The *Aetna* is assigned to the period between the autumn of 43 and the latter part of 42; the *Dirae* and *Lydia*, to the period of confiscations (42-40)—“a record of personal grief.” *Lydia* is the nymph of the *Mincio*, who “recalls by her name the Etruscan origin of Mantua.” On p. 103 it is suggested that Virgil had witnessed with his own eyes the eruptions of *Aetna* that preceded the murder of Julius. But does the “quoties . . . vidimus” of *Geor.* I 471, necessarily mean a personal experience, any more than the “quem vidimus ipsi” of *Ecl.* X 26?

As for the poems of the *Catalepton*, four of them are referred to the three years from 48 to 45: I (the six lines addressed to *Tucca*), VI, XII, XIII (three epigrams directed against an unnamed person, “who is almost certainly Antony”). For Virgil was always a Caesarian, or an Augustan, always a militant anti-Antonian. No. XIII belongs to the last months of 46. From this poem it is inferred that Virgil saw a year of military service—at *Dyrrhachium* and at *Pharsalus*. No. V was apparently written in the spring of 45; No. VII, soon after the spring of 44; II and X, later in 44; VIII, perhaps in the autumn of 42. No. III is made to refer to *Antonius*, about the year 30; No. IX is set “probably in 27”; No. XIV, “shortly before Virgil's last and fatal journey.” Nos. IV and XI, addressed to *Octavius Musa*, Virgil's fellow student, are not precisely dated.

The *Eclogues* also are discussed so far as they possess a biographical interest, and an attempt is made to determine their order and date. *Ecl.* II is the earliest; III is referred to the spring of 41; V, to soon after March, 40; IV, to Sept. 40; I, to perhaps the latter part of 40; VIII and IX, to the latter part of 39 (VI and VII are earlier than VIII); X, to 37. But is the autumn equinox “clearly denoted” by the line, *Aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum*? Why ignore the obvious influence of *Theocritus*, and refer the five lines *Huc ades, o Galatea*, etc. to *Messalla*? And why does everyone who discusses the *Eclogues* ignore the passage in *Propertius* which implies that Virgil wrote some of them at *Tarentum*?

The reference to *Caesar*, p. 3, n. 3, should be B. G. I 39. P. 44, l. 17, ‘*Virgil*’ should be ‘*Horace*.’

W. P. MUSTARD.

A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the first thirteen Centuries of our Era. By LYNN THORNDYKE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923. 2 vols. 877 + 1306 pp. \$10.00.

This is a detailed study of the history of magic and experimental science and their relations to Christian thought during the first thirteen centuries of our era. Under magic the writer includes all occult arts and sciences, superstitions and folklore, and special attention is given to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is probably the most comprehensive treatment of the entire subject yet published. It is an excellent book, well written, well printed, well indexed.

It is divided into five sections: I. The Roman Empire (Pliny, Ptolemy, Galen, etc.); II. Early Christian Thought (Origen, Basil, Augustine, etc.); III. The Early Middle Ages (The Alexander Legend, Post-Classical Medicine, Latin Astrology and Divination, etc.); IV. The Twelfth Century (Adelard of Bath, Bernard Silvester, John of Salisbury, Alexander Neckam, etc.); V. The Thirteenth Century (Michael Scot, William of Auvergne, Bartholomew of England, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, etc.).

In Vol. I, p. 42, the quotation from Pliny is mistranslated; Pliny's claim is that he alone of Romans has celebrated Nature in every particular. Vol. II, p. 132, "Rhenus a mari impetu emittitur" can hardly mean "the Rhine is sent forth by the force of the sea." Vol. II, p. 10, the quotation from the Georgics should have been verified. Vol. I, p. 97, the reference to Cicero in note 9 should be De Div. I. 111. In the verses quoted Vol. I, p. 398, "gemmis" should be "gemmas." Isidore's Etymologiae should be quoted from Lindsay's edition, not from Migne. Vol. II, p. 905, the account of fish that paralyze the fisherman might be compared with Claudian's graphic description of the angler and the torpedo.

W. P. MUSTARD.

L'Etna Poème. Texte établi et traduit par J. VESSEREAU. Paris: Société d'Édition "*Les Belles Lettres*," 1923. xxxiv + 82 pp. 9 frs.

People who have followed any of the recent discussion of the Appendix Vergiliana will be interested in a new edition of the Aetna. This is a revised edition of a good book published in 1905—revised to fit the plan of the new French series of Greek and Latin classics. It contains an introduction, the text, a

prose translation *en regard*, a few brief notes, and a long list of literary parallels. One further parallel might have been quoted—Horace, C. III 4, 58, on lines 61-62. Professor VESSEREAU considers the various guesses as to the authorship of the poem, but finds nothing more convincing than the ancient tradition which makes it an early work of Vergil. As a possible date for its composition, he suggests 50-44 B. C. On p. 8, n. 3, the reference to the Philologus should be Vol. LVII, not VII; and the play of Seneca there discussed is the *Hercules Furens*, not the *Hercules Oetaeus*. On p. xv, l. 14, the important word 'non' is omitted.

W. P. MUSTARD.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Bryn Mawr College,
Bryn Mawr, Pa., Dec. 7, 1923.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

In March of the present year a new classical organization, *La société des études latines*, was founded in Paris; and the first number of its journal, the *Revue des études latines* (for October, 1923), has just reached this country. In addition to reports of the first meetings of the society and papers read by members, this number contains two reports of great interest to classical students: the first an outline of several bibliographical projects by the editor, J. Marouzeau, the second a report of the progress already made in the systematic study of medieval Latin, which has been of late much discussed both in Europe and in this country, by H. Goelzer.

M. Marouzeau alludes to the confusion, the incompleteness, and the delays which have prevailed in all matters bibliographical during and since the war, and to the waste of labor in repeating reviews of certain books many times in different periodicals while others are wholly unmentioned. He suggests also that there is often duplication of research due to the fact that professors in one institution often do not know that the same work has been undertaken somewhere else, and suggests that there ought to be some methodical channel of information which might anticipate such difficulties. These facts (and many others of like nature) have led to the plan, first suggested

two or three years ago, for an international bibliography—an organization under centralized management and on a uniform plan of all the works in every field appearing in each country which would result not only in a complete list of titles but also analyses of content. Such an ideal cannot be realized at once, of course, since it is necessary to achieve it by international agreement. A committee of the *Société des nations* is already at work upon the preliminaries, however, and efforts have been and are being made to get in touch with the interested societies and institutions of other countries, and a series of conferences is being planned. One of the first of these conferences will be devoted to classical philology.

Meanwhile two less ambitious projects are to the fore. Every scholar knows how incomplete and tardy the reviews of literature in Bursian have been in recent years, and the French are planning to issue a complete bibliography of classical philological publications for the past ten years, each title to be accompanied by a brief analysis of content and a list of reviews. If this plan proves after further study to be feasible, the bibliography will be published as a supplement to the *Revue des études latines*, which will in the meantime publish in each number bibliographical reports on selected topics. This plan, therefore, is still for the future, but the second project is now being carried out. This is an extension and revision of the well-known bibliographical parts of the *Revue de philologie*. Last year a *Société de bibliographie classique* was founded, which with the aid of a grant from the *Confédération des soc. scientifiques françaises* has brought up to date and completed this section of the *Revue de philologie*. A double fascicle (1919-1920) of the part called *Revue des comptes-rendus* has just appeared and a similar one for 1921-1922 is in press. Moreover, a fascicle of the part called *Revue des revues*, containing not only the reports for 1921 but also a good part of those which were omitted during and after the war, will soon appear. These reports will hereafter be arranged by subject.

Thus the energy of France seems in a fair way to restore some degree of completeness and system to the field of bibliography which has for so long been sadly out of joint, and the classical philologists are leading the way.

M. Goelzer has some interesting things to say about the revision of Ducange which was decided upon in principle at a meeting under the auspices of the *Union académique internationale* in 1920—an association in which many nations, including the United States, are represented. The task is so enormous that it has been decided to begin and carry through at once only a part of it. This part is a dictionary of medieval Latin supplementary to Forcellini and covering the period from

about 425 to about 1000 A. D. This work must be a collaboration, and M. Goelzer has been made supervisor. The work is already under way and M. Goelzer gives some illustrations of its plan and method. He closes with a request that all scholars who wish to collaborate in such parts of the work as have not yet been assigned should write to him for information. His address is 32, rue Guillaume-Tell, Paris XVIIe.

A. L. WHEELER.

Cambridge, Mass., Nov. 30, 1923.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

A committee on Mediæval Latin studies with representatives from history, modern languages, philosophy and classics, now organized under the American Council of Learned Societies, has lately issued a bulletin reviewing its activities of the past two years and outlining its plans for the future. Any member of the American Philological Association who is interested and who has not received a copy, may secure one by writing to the secretary, George R. Coffman, 184 Widener Library, Cambridge, Mass.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN.

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

October 23, 1831—January 9, 1924

Professor Gildersleeve is no longer with us. On January 9, after a brief illness, he peacefully passed away. In 1915, he retired from professorial work. To the very end, except for a period of illness following in the wake of a surgical operation, he enjoyed extraordinary health. His mental vigor never abated. Unfortunately, his sight had begun to fail, and during the last few years ordinary print was illegible to him. But the devotion of relatives and friends and, more especially, the generosity of his daughter enabled him to avail himself of the eyes of others. With the aid of these eyes and by drawing on the rich stores of his memory, he held daily converse with his favorite authors and kept himself informed of developments in literature, philology and current history. He also took great pleasure in the composition of verse, and with this pastime he beguiled many a wakeful hour of the night.

Professor Gildersleeve was born in Charleston, S. C. His father, a Presbyterian evangelist, whose chief duty was the editing of a religious weekly, took charge of his early education. The boy had an absorbing passion for literature and composition. He began the study of Latin at a tender age, and at twelve had acquired some knowledge of Greek. When he was between twelve and thirteen, he passed out of his father's hands into those of Mr. William E. Bailey, a teacher of the classics, who prepared him for the College of Charleston. In 1845, when still a freshman, he was obliged to leave college and remove with his father to Richmond, Va. 'For a year or more' he was his father's clerk and bookkeeper, but relief from the 'sadly idle time' thus spent was obtained when in December 1846 he was sent to Jefferson College, Pa. In 1847, he was transferred to Princeton, where he was graduated in 1849. Nearly all of his time at college was devoted to the study of literature—English, French, Italian, German and Spanish. In the autumn of 1849, when not quite eighteen, he accepted the classical mastership in Dr. Maupin's private school at Richmond. Besides practising Greek and Latin prose composition, he became passionately fond of Goethe, to whose writings he had been introduced by the study of Carlyle. This, he says, was the epoch of his Teutomania, the time when he read German, wrote German, listened to German, and even talked German. In the summer of 1853, he sailed for Germany. Of the three years of travel and study abroad, most of the time

was spent in Germany. In spite of insufficient preparation in the classics, and in spite of special aptitude and equipment for the pursuit of the study of literature, the young student, after some wavering, decided to devote himself to the classics. He studied at Berlin, Goettingen and Bonn, and there he heard, among others, Boeckh, Franz, K. F. Hermann, Schneidewin, Bernays, Welcker, and Ritschl. By dint of Herculean effort, he won the degree of Ph. D. after but five *semesters* of university study, and then returned to America.

The next three years were spent in study, writing and tutoring. They were years of bitter waiting. Gradually despairing of a classical career, the young doctor was launching out into literary life when, in the autumn of 1856, he was elected professor of Greek in the University of Virginia. Five years later the Civil War broke out. During the continuance of this war and for a year after, he bore also the burdens of the professorship of Latin. And not only this, but during the summer months he rendered military service, and it was while he was on the staff of General Gordon, in the summer of 1864, that he received a bullet wound which kept him on his back for five months and left him with a permanent limp. In 1866, he married Eliza Fisher Colston, of Virginia, who survives him. Many a time in after years he expressed gratitude for the singularly happy married life with which they had been blessed. The years spent at the University of Virginia were busy years. The first seven were years of preparation. Thereafter, the stress of the times forced the young scholar to resume his pen. He made editorial contributions to the *Richmond Examiner* (1863-1864), wrote magazine articles, and published a number of books: *Latin Grammar*, 1867, 1873; *Latin Primer, Reader, Exercise Book*, edition of *Persius*, 1875.

In December 1875, he accepted the invitation to the professorship of Greek in the newly founded Johns Hopkins University. He entered upon his duties at the opening of the academic year in the autumn of 1876. This was the beginning of the most brilliant period of his career. Writing in 1891, he said: "The greater freedom of action, the larger appliances, the wider and richer life, the opportunities for travel and for personal intercourse have stimulated production and have made my last fourteen years my most fruitful years in the eyes of the scholarly world." In 1877 appeared his edition of *Justin Martyr* (Apologies and Epistle to Diognetus). In 1880, at the suggestion of the late President Gilman, he founded the *American Journal of Philology*, of which he maintained the editorship for forty years. In those days, founding a scientific journal was no slight task, and keeping it alive was even a greater. In spite of this heavy additional burden, the editor and professor found time to engage in research, to write books,

and to review in the pages of the Journal large numbers of current publications. In 1885 appeared his edition of *Pindar* (The Olympian and Pythian Odes), which was one of his finest pieces of work. In 1890 was published a volume of *Essays and Studies*, the greater part of which had been previously published. This volume met with such immediate favor that it rapidly went out of print, and for many years copies of it have been at a premium. At the University of Virginia, the first draft of a Greek Syntax had been prepared. The scope of this was later extended, and an Historical Syntax was projected. In spite of the fact that examples had been collected for many years, syntactical formulae worked out, monographs published, and grammatical points discussed in innumerable reviews and brief mentions, the plan of the undertaking proved too vast for execution by a single man; but, with the present writer's collaboration, the first part of the *Syntax of Classical Greek* was brought out in 1900, and a second part appeared in 1911. In 1909, *Hellas and Hesperia*—three lectures on the Barbour-Page Foundation of the University of Virginia—was published, and this was followed in 1915 by *The Creed of the Old South*—a republication, with notes, of two articles that had previously appeared in the Atlantic Monthly. The number of monographs, reviews and brief mentions that issued from the pen of Professor Gildersleeve during the long tenure of his Johns Hopkins professorship is so great that there is not space here to enumerate them. The *Indiculus Syntacticus* (A. J. P. XXXVI 481-487) gives an idea of the vast extent of his syntactical contributions, and the *Index Scoliodromicus* (A. J. P. XLII 370-382) affords a glimpse of what was done by him in other than grammatical lines.

Professor Gildersleeve was no narrow specialist. He was wont to speak of himself as a humble syntactician—and syntactician he was, syntactician such as had never been before. But he was much more than that. The range of his interests was wide; his scholarship of the broadest. He not only lectured on Greek syntax and conducted exercises in Greek composition, but, at various times, gave courses in Greek rhythmic and metrics, hermeneutics and criticism, rhetoric, epigraphy, and other subjects; and he could be as enthusiastic about a question relating to biography, mythology, topography, or some other branch of classical antiquity, as about a question of syntax. Attention has above been called to his knowledge of Roman, English, German, French, Italian and Spanish literature. Of Greek authors, there were few with whom he did not have more than a bowing acquaintance. Though Aristophanes, the Attic orators, Thucydides and Plato formed the cycle of study of his seminary, he supplemented the study of these authors by lectures on Greek comedy, historiography, oratory and philoso-

phy, and found time to conduct courses in Homer, Pindar, the other lyric poets, the tragedians, Herodotus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Polybius, the critical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pausanias, Lucian, Philostratus and others. The fact is that, while the study of syntax had a peculiar fascination for him, the literary interest was paramount, and, in wide and intimate knowledge of literature, he surpassed many of those who made the study of literature their sole occupation.

Few great scholars possess the faculty of artistic expression to a noteworthy degree. Professor Gildersleeve did. His pen matched his genius. It would be difficult to describe his style. If ever it was true of a writer that the style was the man, it was true of him. Clearness, simplicity, conciseness, precision, ease, elegance, daintiness, elaboration, beauty, swiftness, smoothness, ruggedness, allusiveness, brilliance, penetration, imagination, wit, humor, satire, poise, geniality, austerity, fearlessness, timidity, impetuosity, severity, generosity, pride, humility, loyalty, love of accuracy, hatred of sham—these are some of the qualities that characterized the style and the man. If comparison with one of the ancients were permitted, one might think of Demosthenes. But comparisons are odious. Certain it is that, when Professor Gildersleeve was at his best, his style was inimitable, and many of his writings are a joy forever.

It was inevitable that a man of such keenness of intellect, versatility of genius, wealth of knowledge, catholicity of taste, mobility of temperament and breadth of human experience should have been an inspiring teacher. The years spent as a student under Professor Gildersleeve were years of intellectual intoxication. Enthusiasm never waned. Inspiration was an incentive to study. The spur of reprimand and correction was not needed. And how deep was the affection and the reverence for the teacher! What a place he held in the hearts of his friends! How highly he was esteemed by his colleagues! No wonder that honors were showered on him at home and abroad. He was twice elected president of the American Philological Association. He was chosen honorary member of many foreign societies, created fellow of learned academies, and made the recipient of honorary degrees from many institutions of learning. He was everywhere called master by those who themselves were masters, and in the American classical pantheon he sat enthroned as Zeus.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allmen (Oskar von). *Das Kind in der epischen Dichtung der Griechen.* Inaug.-diss. Bern, *Paul Haupt*, 1923. Pp. 67. 8°.

Athenaeum. *Studii Periodici di Letteratura e Storia.* Nuova Serie. Anno I, Fasc. IV, Ottobre 1923. Pavia, *Amministrazione dell' Athenaeum*.

Babees' Book: *Medieval Manners for the Young: Done into Modern English from Dr. Furnivall's Texts by Edith Rickert.* London, *Chatto & Windus*, 1923. pp. xxv + 203. \$1.85.

Bailey (Cyril), ed. *The Legacy of Rome. Essays by various scholars.* Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1923. pp. xii + 512, 8°.

Bearman (Ethel C.) *Translation from and into French. A Guide to French Unseen Translation and Composition.* New York: *E. P. Dutton & Co., Ltd.*, 1923. 91 pp. \$.75.

Bell (Andrew J.) *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction. Studies in Numbers and Figures.* London, *Oxford University Press*; Toronto, *Victoria College Press*, 1923. Pp. viii + 468.

Bilabel (Fr.) *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus.* Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber*, 1923. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 149). Pp. 63, 12°.

Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique. I-VI. Quarante-Septième Année, Janvier-Juin 1923. Paris, *E. de Boccard*.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 1, Octobre 1923. Paris.

Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. I, Part IV. June, 1923. University of Wales. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price \$2.50.

Calhoun (George Miller). *Greek Law and Modern Jurisprudence.* (Reprinted from the *California Law Review* of July, 1923). Pp. 295-312.

Callimachi fragmenta nuper reperta, edidit Rudolfus Pfeiffer. Editio Maior. Bonnae, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*, 1923. Pp. 122. 12°.

Carnoy (Albert). *Manuel de Linguistique grecque.* Paris, *Edouard Champion*, 1924. Pp. 426, 8°.

Chaytor (H. J.) *The Troubadours and England.* Cambridge: *University Press*, 1923. Pp. vi + 164. 6 s. net.

Cicero, *The Speeches with an English translation.* By N. H. Watts. London, *Wm. Heineman*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. (Loeb Classical Library.)

Cooper (Lane). *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, with an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the 'Tractatus Coislinianus.'* New York, *Harcourt, Brace and Company*, 1922. Pp. xxi + 323. 8°.

Cornélius Népos. *Oeuvres.* Texte établi et traduit par Anne-Marie Guillemin. Paris: *Société d'Édition "Les Belles-Lettres,"* 1923. Pp. xxv + 182.

Ebersolt (Jean). *Les Arts Somptuaires de Byzance.* Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, 1923. Pp. 164, 4°.

Galenus De Sanitate Tuenda, De Alimentorum Facultatibus, De Bonis Malisque Sucis, De Victu Attenuante, De Ptisana. Ediderunt Konradus

Koch, Georgius Helmreich, Carolus Kalbfleisch, Otto Hartlich. Leipzig and Berlin, *B. G. Teubner*, 1923. (*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, V 4, 2.) Pp. lxxiii + 522, 8°.

Gragger (Robert). Eine altungarische Marienklage. Berlin und Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.*, 1923. Pp. 20, 8°. (*Ungarische Bibliothek*, 7.)

Greene (William Chase). The Achievement of Greece. Cambridge: *Harvard University Press*, 1923. Pp. x + 334. \$3.50.

Hagendahl (Harald). *Studia Ammianea*. Inaug. diss. Uppsala, *A. B. Akademiska Bokhandeln*, 1921. (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1921 Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper* 2). Pp. xvi + 141.

——— Zu Ammianus Marcellinus. (Särtryck ur *Strena Philologica Upsaliensis*, 1922). 17 pp.

——— Die Perfektformen auf -ere und -erunt. Uppsala, *Almqvist & Wiksells*; Leipzig, *Otto Harrassowitz*, 1923. (Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 22: 3). 46 pp.

Hardy (E. G.) The Monumentum Ancyranum. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1923. Pp. 166, 8°. \$2.85.

Hespéris. Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études marocaines. Année 1923. 1^{er} et 2^e trimestres. Paris, *Larose*.

Hoschander (Jacob). The Book of Esther in the Light of History. Philadelphia, *The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning*, 1923. Pp. ix + 318, 8°. \$2.50.

Inter-América. English: Volume VII, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, October and December 1923, February 1924. Español: Vol. VII, No. 4, Noviembre de 1923. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Company*.

Journal of Education and The School World. London, *William Rice*, October, November, December, 1923, January, 1924.

Knapp (Charles). Bibliography of Charles Knapp 1893-1923. Geneva, N. Y., *W. F. Humphrey*, 1923. Pp. 77, 8°.

Kuenzi (Adolphe). 'Επιδοσις: Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträge zu Zeiten der Not in Athen. Mit einem Anhang: Epidoseis in den übrigen griechischen Städten. Inaug.-diss. Bern, *Paul Haupt*, 1923. Pp. 80.

Laurand (L.) Manuel des études grecques et latines. Appendice I. Les Sciences dans l'Antiquité. Paris, *Auguste Picard*, 1923. Pp. 51.

Lavagnini (Bruno). I Lirici greci, illustrati per le scuole. Torino, Milano (etc.) *G. B. Paravia & C.* Pp. vi + 164, 8°. L. 9.50.

Littmann (Enno). Jäger und Prinzessin. Ein neuarabisches Märchen aus Jerusalem. Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber*, 1923. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 150). Pp. 32, 2°.

Mandeville's Travels. Translated from the French of Jean d'Outre-meuse. Edited by P. Hamelius from Ms. Cotton Titus c. XVI in the British Museum. Vol. II. Introduction and Notes. London, *Oxford University Press*, 1923. Pp. vi + 189, 8°. (Early English Text Society, No. 154.) 15 sh.

Montgomery (Marshall). Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement. Part I. From the Renaissance to the Thalia-Fragment of Hölderlin's 'Hyperion' (1794). *Oxford University Press*, 1923. vi + 232 pp. 8°. \$4.20.

Moore (Sir Norman). The Book of the Foundation of St. Bartholomew's Church in London. . . . Edited from the Original Manuscript in the British Museum. London: *Oxford University Press*, 1923. Pp. xii + 72.

Muséon. Revue d'études orientales. Tome XXXVI (Cahiers 1-2). Paris, 1923.

Norwood (Gilbert). *The Art of Terence*. Oxford, *Basil Blackwell*, 1923. Pp. 156, 8°. 7 sh. 6 d.

Nutting (Herbert C.) *The Use of Forem in Tacitus*. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1923. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 7, No. 6, pp. 209-219.)

Our Debt to Greece and Rome. Boston, *Marshall Jones Company*, 1923:

3 A. Lucas (F. L.) *Euripides and His Influence*.

6. Cooper (Lane). *The Poetics of Aristotle, Its Meaning and Influence*.

11. Harrington (Karl Pomeroy). *Catullus and His Influence*.

22. Kent (Roland G.) *Language and Philology*.

24. Hyde (Walter Woodburn). *Greek Religion and Its Survivals*.

Patch (Howard Rollin). *Fortuna in Old French Literature*. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. IV, No. 4, July 1923.)

——— *The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Roman Literature and in the Transitional Period*. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. III, No. 3, April 1922.)

——— *The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Philosophy and Literature*. (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, Vol. III, No. 4, July 1922.)

Pease (Arthur Stanley). *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione liber secundus*. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois Press*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 2. May, 1923.) \$1.50.

Perry (B. E.) *The Significance of the Title in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. (Reprinted for private circulation from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, July 1923, pp. 229-238.)

Petrarch, *Epistolae Selectae*. Edidit A. F. Johnson. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1923. Pp. x + 276, 8°. \$2.85.

Philological Quarterly, Vol. II, October 1923, No. 4; Vol. III, January 1924, No. 1. Published at the *University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa.

Platon. *Oeuvres complètes*. Tome III, 2e partie. *Gorgias-Ménon*. Texte établi et traduit par Alfred Croiset. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1923. Pp. 89-280 (duplicate numbering). 8°.

——— *Oeuvres complètes*. Tome VIII, 1re partie. *Parménide*. Texte établi et traduit par Auguste Diès. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1923. Pp. xix + 115 (actually 230). 8°.

Popper (William). *Parallelism in Isaiah, Chapters 1-35 and 37, 22-35. The Reconstructed Text (Hebrew)*. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (University of California Publications, Semitic Philology, Vol. 1, No. 5, pp. 1-116, August 20, 1923.)

Problem of Grammar, The. July, 1923. (The English Association, Pamphlet No. 56.) Pp. 28. \$.85.

Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos. *Hercera Época*. Año XXVII, Abril a Junio de 1923. Madrid, *Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos."*

Revue des études latines, publiée par la Société des Études Latines. 1re année, Fasc. 1, Octobre 1923. Paris, *Edouard Champion*.

Ripman (Walter) and Hughes (M. Vivian). *A Rapid Latin Course*. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1923. Pp. viii + 248. 12°.

Ross (W. D.) *Aristotle*. London, *Methuen & Co., Ltd.*, 1923. Pp. vi + 300, 8°. 12/6 net.

Roswitha, *The Plays of*. Translated by Christopher St. John. London, *Chatto & Windus*, 1923. Pp. xxxv + 160. \$1.85. 12°.

Rudler (Gustave). *Les Techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires en littérature française moderne*. Oxford, *Imprimerie de l'Université*, 1923. Pp. xv + 204, 8°. \$2.85.

Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More. Papers by Alfred W. Pollard, W. W. Greg, E. Maunde Thompson, J. Dover Wilson & R. W. Chambers. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1923. Pp. 229, 8°.

Stewart (H. F.) and Tilley (Arthur). *The Classical Movement in French Literature*. Cambridge: *University Press*, 1923. Pp. x + 164. 7 s. net.

S. P. E., Tract No. XIV: Bradley (Henry) and Bridges (Robert), *On the Terms Briton, British, Britisher*. H. W. Fowler, *Preposition at End*. *At the Clarendon Press*, 1923. Pp. 25. \$.80.

— Tract No. XV: Fowler (H. W.) *The Split Infinitive*, etc. Robert Bridges, *Pictorial, Picturesque*, etc. *At the Clarendon Press*, 1923. Pp. 23. \$.85.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vol. I. Lugduni Batavorum, A. W. Sijthoff, 1923. Pp. 68, 8°.

Tacite. *Annales*, Livres I-III. Texte établi et traduit par Henri Goelzer. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1923. Pp. xxx + 165 (actually 330), 8°.

Taylor (Lily Ross). *Local Cults in Etruria*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. II. *American Academy in Rome*, 1923. Pp. xi + 258. 8°.

Toynbee (Paget). *The Bearing of the Cursus on the Text of Dante's De Vulgari Eloquentia*. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI). London, *Humphrey Milford*. 1 sh. 6 d. net. Pp. 19.

Trofimov (M. V.) and Jones (Daniel). *The Pronunciation of Russian*. Cambridge: *University Press*, 1923. Pp. x + 252.

Van Hook (La Rue). *Greek Life and Thought*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1923. Pp. xiv + 320, 8°.

Wells (Joseph). *Studies in Herodotus*. Oxford, *Basil Blackwell*, 1923. Pp. 232, 8°. 7 sh. 6 d.

Wilson (Sir James). *The Dialect of Robert Burns as Spoken in Central Ayrshire*. *Oxford University Press*, 1923. Pp. 195, 8°. \$2.00.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLV, 2

WHOLE No. 178

I.—ON THE ARMENIAN VERSION OF PLATO'S LAWS AND MINOS.

By the kindness of Professor Gildersleeve I was able to publish in Volumes XII to XVI of this journal collations of the old Armenian version of Plato, which comprises the Euthyphro, Apology, Timaeus, Laws and Minos. I never completed these studies for the Timaeus, Minos and Laws VII-XII, but waited for Schanz to complete his edition, which he never lived to do. Meanwhile Professor Burnet has finished his task and Professor E. B. England his scholarly commentary on the Laws. With their aid I resume my work.

And first let me supplement my remarks in Vol. XII of the A. J. P. on the family of the text which the Armenian translator, Gregory Magistros, used about the year A. D. 1000, especially in respect of the Laws. A lacuna of 687 letters is shared by it, by the Paris Codex 1807 (Burnet's A) and by Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1 (Burnet's O and Bekker's Ω). It extends from 783 B *παίδων δέ* to 783 D *καλῶς*, and there is no homoio-teleuton to explain it. These three sources therefore form a single family. Arm A and O are further connected by a series of lesser lacunae, e. g. 896 C 9 om. *καὶ βουλήσεις*, retained in L (Cod. Laurent. LXXX. 17), by second hand in O and Eusebius. So at 864 B 5 Arm A O omit *πάνυ μὲν οὖν* retained by L (ut vid.) and O².

But the lacunae shared with A O by the Armenian are very rare. They represent a remote archetype of the three texts.

The faults however and lacunae which, being shared by A and O, constitute them a minor family by themselves are very numerous. In such cases L and Arm usually retain the right

reading, often with the suffrage of correctors of A and O. In the ninth book alone we have examples at 855 B 6, 856 C 6, 857 D 2, 865 A 1, 865 B 1, 869 C 4, 872 C 3, 873 A 5, 874 A 7, 874 C 1, 878 C 8, 879 B 3. There is hardly a page where examples lack. The common lacunae of A O, not shared by L or Armenian are also very numerous. Here is a list of the longer ones:

1. 764 C, of 35 letters; 2. 841 C, of 22; 3. 842 A, of 13; 4. 849 E, of 17; 5. 877 E, of 14; 6. 902 E, of 25; 7. 913 D, of 28; 8. 925 E4, of 30; 9. 925 E7, of 16.

The longer lacunae peculiar to A are the following:

10. 645 E, of 44 letters; 11. 668 D, of 17; 12. 669 C, of 17; 13. 684 D and E, of 35; 14. 731 C, of 18; 15. 745 A-C, of 711; 16. 874 B, of 119; 17. 903 C, of 28. Of the above Nos. 1, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 (17x42), 16 (17x7), 17 must have arisen in the copying of a book written 17 letters to the line. The long lacuna at 783 B is equivalent to 40 lines, normally of 17 letters, and must be indefinitely earlier than the lacunae shared by A and O, older still than those peculiar to A, of which No. 15 of 711 letters might be explained as the dropping of a column of 42 lines normally of 17 letters each. No. 16 of 119 letters represents seven lines of 17 letters each. Most of the shorter lacunae are due to similar endings. Hermann's dislocated passage at 642 A B contained 68 (17x4) letters, and this fact is a surprising confirmation of his conjecture.

I have not yet mentioned the lacuna of 40 letters in 822 B, common to A and Arm, but not shared by O. A and O cohere by so many lacunae and faults not met with in Arm., that they must both go back to a common archetype later than the archetype Arm—A—O. We do not therefore expect to find a lacuna common to Arm. A from which O is exempt. The lacuna is due to similar ending and may perhaps have arisen independently in Arm. and A; if not, it must once have stood in the tradition of O and have been filled in by a corrector of that codex or rather of its ancestor. The omission in A Arm. of *καί* in 645 E 4 and of *τῆς* in 735 E 6 are equally puzzling.

No interest attaches to the exclusive lacunae of Arm., which are numerous, except where a Greek source shares them. Thus, in 896 C9, the words *καὶ βουλήσεις* are given in Eusebius LO², but are lacking in A O Arm. Ficino had them (*voluntates*) in

his codex which was probably the Cod. Laurent. LXXX. 17, called L by Burnet and Flor. δ by Stallbaum. Some of the lacunae of Arm. may have stood in its Greek original, but we have no way of detecting them.

In my earlier articles I have said most of what there was to say about the unique codex of the version preserved in the San Lazaro Library in Venice, Cod. No. 1123. It contains 444 pages of one column each, 20 cm. long and 15 cm. broad, of 30 lines, each of 37 to 40 letters. The text, 843 B 5 to 844 B 4, two pages of the Arm, is lost. In the translator's codex a capital letter often marked the beginning of a new sentence or paragraph, but when this failed to coincide with the beginning of a new line, the capital was set at the beginning of a line as near to the beginning of the paragraph as possible. The eleventh-century Lincoln College Codex of Philo is a good example of such a codex. Now in the Armenian a full stop is usually set, regardless of the sense, before the capital letter. To take an example: in 671 A one full stop is set after *σκοπώμεθα* and another after *θορυβώδης*, where in the Greek a full stop precedes each of these words. The Armenian's Greek line therefore contained the words *δὴ εἰ τοῦθ' οὕτω γέγονεν . θορυβώδης*, that is 28 letters. Here is another example: at p. 755, a full stop precedes *τε καί* in D 5, *δὲ αὐτοῖσι* in D 7, *τὴν δ'* in E 1, *καὶ περὶ* in E 3. These intervals contain respectively 82, 83 and 55 letters, that is approximately 28x3, 28x3, and 28x2. Many lacunae of the Armenian represent 28 letters of the Greek or multiples of 28, e. g. 628 C, 53 letters; 644 A, 113; 647 E, 57; 765 C, 57; 790 E, 27; Minos 320 B, 58. In such cases we may suppose that he has dropt out one, two or more lines. Most of the lacunae, however, of the manuscript probably arose within the pale of the Armenian tradition, and some are due to similar endings hardly visible in the Greek.

A glance at the following collation of the Arm. with the Greek sources shews that it seldom goes alone with A without Burnet's adoption of their common reading. But it must be remarked that to share in a correct reading proves no community of tradition. Only common lacunae and common blunders prove that. The same remark applies to cases where Arm and O share the true reading. Faults and lacunae com-

mon to Arm. and O are conspicuous by their absence. Nor can I discover half a dozen such common to L. and Arm., though in many cases the Arm. is the only text to share the right reading with L. In such cases there need be no textual affinity between L and Arm. It only means that the other sources have gone astray together.

In several cases where the other sources flagrantly disagree the Arm. omits the disputed word altogether. These cases puzzle me. Did the Greek scribe rendered find one reading in the margin of his archetype, another in its text, and leave them both out, waiting for a *διορθωτής* to decide and fill up the blank?

Professor Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (W-M in my collation) is premature when he condemns the Arm. version as late and of illusory value, though he admits that it varies little from A and goes back to the same archetype (Platon, Vol. II, 2d ed. Berlin, 1920). Though only executed about A. D. 1000, the translator's codex may easily have been much earlier. It was anyhow free from most of the lacunae and blunders which beset A alone, or associate it with O. In hundreds of cases it overleaps A and O, together or separately, to associate itself with the independent codex L or with ancient citations or with conjectures of modern scholars. Thus at 627 A 5, 681 A 1, 735 A 4, 775 E 2, 796 D, 871 D 7, 960 C 8, foll., 969 B 1 (ut vid.), 697 C 7, 820 A 8 and elsewhere it verifies W-M's own conjectures. It is not to exaggerate, to say that the Arm, through its often, I admit, turbid medium, sets before us a text of the same archetypal family as A, but very much purer and in order of descent, if not of time, very much older than A,—a text in which many variants, to-day only found in L or Ficino or ancient citations, still stood. For the ascertaining then of what stood in the archetype which it shared with A and O, its evidence is important.

I have mostly confined myself in these pages to arraying its evidence with regard to readings where the Greek texts differ, but have also adduced its readings where they support the conjectures of modern scholars. In a subsequent contribution I hope I may be permitted to treat of the Armenian text of Timaeus in the same way, and finally to discuss a few select variants of the Armenian chiefly in Laws VII-XII, in Minos and Timaeus, which have neither been conjectured nor appear

in any of the Greek codices, so far as I am through Professor Burnet's edition acquainted with them. In this collation I, as a rule, have omitted them.

Professor Burnet's Sigla.

A = Cod. Parisinus graecus 1807.

A² = idem post diorthosin (eadem manu ut videtur).

A³ = manus saeculi XII (ut videtur).

a = manus Constantini (saec. XIV).

a² = manus altera saeculi XIV.

a³ = manus saeculi XV-XVI.

L = Cod. Laurentianus LXXX 17 (= Stallb. Flor. 8).

O = Cod. Vaticanus graecus 1 (Bekkeri Ω).

Scr. recc. = lectiones librorum post litteras renatas exaratorum.

To the above add

W-M = Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's *Plato*, Berlin, 1920.

Note.—As references to Greek sources are taken from Professor Burnet's edition, Oxford, 1913, I exhort my readers to refer to it. If they do not they will often find my collation obscure. They should note in particular that the variants of the Armenian given in the first column are those approved by him and adopted in his text, except where in the second column B (i. e. Burnet) is attached to a variant not found in the Armenian.

*Armenian with Greek Sources
which agree, and with
Burnet.*

*Greek Sources and Burnet (B)
where they differ from
Armenian.*

625 A 6 ἀηδῶς (Arm renders in
sense of "less") A

ἀηδῶς ἡμᾶς LO

626 B 2 οὐτ' ἐπιτηδεύμάτων A²
D 2 λέγωμεν ALO

om. A

λέγομεν Eus. et fecit A² cum
Vat. 1029, B

627 A5 = "Nam valde est tale
maxime neque minime in
civitatibus." Therefore
transfer καὶ to before οὐχ.
So W-M: "πάνυ καὶ σφόδρα

werden nicht copuliert;
daher wollte Cobet καὶ
streichen. Umstellung ist
besser."

- 627 D 6 ἐμοὶ AL καὶ ἐμοὶ O (sed καὶ punct. not.)
- 629 A 1 αὐτοῖς Bekker αὐτοὺς libri
B 8 ἀνερώμεθα AO δὴ ἐρώμεθα A² (δὴ supra ἀν)
D 3 ἔφαμεν libri φαμέν Photius (prob. Cobet)
D 7 om. ἐπαινῶν. Secl. Bad- B and libri retain
ham
E 6 γιγνομένους Eus. γιγνόμενον libri
630 A 7 δὴ Proclus in Remp. δὲ Eus.
187, 16 Kroll cum libris
B 2 αὐτῆς μόνης ἀνδρείας om. add. Eus. Proclus B
w. libri
B 4 ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ libri ἐν ᾧ π. Eus. B
B 7 om. εὖ libri εὖ Eus. B
D 3 om. νομοθέτας. England retain B cett.
E 1 θείας πραγματείας ut vid. θείας libri B
(πολιτείας add. Stephanus
alii: forte ἀληθείας)
- 631 B 8 om. τις Eus. τις libri cum Stob. B
B 9 πόλις [? κτᾶται, a lacuna παρίστασθαι Stob.
follows as far as εἰ δὲ μή. Libri and Eus. have πόλις
κτᾶται. So B
C 4 δὲ δὴ libri cum Stob. δὲ Eus.
C 5 φρόνησις. Coni. Richards φρονήσει B cett.
C 6 ἀγαθῶν A Eus. ἀγαθὸν Vulg.
C 7 νοῦ Eus. νοῦν ALO Stob.
D 6 posterius τε A et fecit O² δὲ O Eus.
(τ s. v.)
- 632 B 5 ἕκαστον AO ἕκαστοι L
C 5 ἐπιστήσῃ (ut vid.) OEus. ἐπιστήσεται A sed οἱ supra αἱ
(sic) A²
- 633 D 3, 4 κηρίνους ποιοῦσιν πρὸς ταῦτα σύμπαντα. Οἶμαι μὲν οὖν πρὸς ταῦτα σύμπαντα.
Cp. A, ποιοῦσιν [οἶμαι μὲν ποιοῦσι πρὸς ταῦτα ξύμπαντα (om.

- οὕτω π]ρὸς ταῦτα ξύμπαντα (sed inclusa in ras.): κ. πρὸς τ. ξ. in Marg. A² cum ind. ad. ποιῶσιν.
B reads ποιῶσιν κηρ. οἶμαι μὲν οὖν. πρὸς τ. π.
- 634 B 3 ἡμῖν (or? ἡμᾶς) LO² ὑμῖν AOB
C6 ἐζήτει in Marg. γρ. AO. ψέξῃ τι A (ψ in ras.) Fic.
D 7 εἶπερ καὶ εἰ Eus.
E7 λέγεις κελεύεις Eus.
- 635 B 1 εὐνοίαι ex ἐννοίαι fecit A²
B 4 μόνοις O et in Marg. a² νόμοις A
Arm. has equivalent of κοι-
νὸν or κοινῶς or κοινοῖς, ? a
corr. of μόνοις
- 636 B 4 παλαιὸν νόμιμον L (ut vid.) (Arm has "law" in nominative, which argues νόμιμον rather than νόμον)
D 7 ἤθεσι(ν) ALO ἔθεσι al.
- 637 A 7 Arm = ἀπάντων ὅστις ἀπαντῶν. ἀπάντων A ἀπαντῶν B etc.
- 638 D 4 χρώμενοι LO om. A
- 639 A 2 δὴ AO δέ L
A 7 ἡγούμεθα Eus. ἡγώμεθα libri
B 6 καὶ libri καὶ Stephanus B
C 5 οἰώμεθα AO οἰόμεθα A² Eus. B
C 5 ἄν O δὴ AO² (s. v.) Eus. B
D 5 μῶν A (sed ras. ante μ) O in Marg. γρ. ὑμῶν AO
- 640 A 11 τῶν δειλῶν A τὸν δειλὸν LO
D 6 νέων So Badham. Richards conj. νέος νέων. νέος B cett.
- E1 αὐτῶ L (ut vid.) O² αὐτῶν AO
- 641 A 1 ἀνατρέπει. Richards conj. ἀνατρέπει B cett.
- 641 B 5 βραχύ τι τῇ B. Om. τι AL βραχύ τι O (sed ἡ supra ι)
- 642 A 1 περὶ σμικρὰ AO περὶ σμικροῦ L (ut vid.) O²
- 643 B 5 δεῖν om. Eus.
C 6 παιδικῶν παιδιῶν B cett.
D 4 ὑμῖν L (ut vid.) ἡμῖν AO
E 2 μάλα libri cum Eus. ἄλλα Stallbaum

- E 2 πεπαιδευμένων . . . ἀν-
 θρώπων ALO cum Eus.
- 644 A 6 δὴ AO
 παντὸς LO
 C 4 αὐτῶν Vulg.
 E 3 ἀνθέλκουςαι A (λ in
 ras.) LO
- 645 A 3 οὔσαν AO cum Eus.
- A 5 τῇ om. Eus.
 A 6 βεβαίου L et γρ. O
- A 7 ἐν om. libri
 B 5 τούτων
- 645 B 6 αὐτοῦ τούτου (ut vid.)
 Eus.
- E 4 om. ναί A (τὸ ναὶ ἐν ἄλ-
 λους οὐ κεῖται in Marg. O)
- E 7 τί μὴν . . . E 8 ἐγκρατὴς
 in Marg. A
- 646 C 4 φαρμακοποσίᾳ L (ut
 vid.) O et fecit A² (ι s. v.)
- 647 A 10 τούτῳ A et γρ. O
 C 10 δειλία. So γρ. in Marg.
 AO (ἀπ' ὀρθώσεως οὐκ εὔ O)
 E 2 ἐθέλη LO et in Marg.
 γρ. α²
- 648 D 4 ὀρθῶς ALO² (ὥς s. v.)
- 649 B 1 ἡ s. v. A
 D 1 τι ALO²
 D 9 παιδιᾶς, fecit A²
- 653 A 1 ἐλέγομεν. Schanz
 A 1 τοῦτο LO
 B 6 αὐτῇσ θ' Vulg.
- C 9 τὰ Aldina
 D 4 τὰς τε τροφὰς γενομένας
 ALO
 D 5 ἃ ALO
- 654 A 2 ἔνρυθμον
- πεπαιδευμένον . . . ἄνθρωπον al.
- δὲ L (ut vid.) Eus.
 παντὶ AO² Eus. B
 αὐτὸν A Eus. B
 ἀνθέλκουσιν Eus. B
- οὔσαν καὶ μονοειδῇ cod. Riccardi-
 anus
 τῇ B cett.
 βιαίου O Eus. B : βιαίου ÷ ÷ ÷
 ÷ ÷ ÷ ÷ ÷ ÷ A
 ἐν Eus. B.
 om. Eus.
 τούτου τοῦ B cett.
- ναί L (ut vid.) OB
 om. A
- φαρμακοποσίαν A
- τούτων O
 διαίτη A (sed ιαίτη in ras.) O
- ἔλη A
- ὀρθὸν O
 om. pr. A
 om. O
 παιδείας (ut vid.) A
 λέγομεν B cett.
 τούτου AB
 αὐτῇσθ' AO : αὐτῇ ἔσθ' Eus. : αὐτῇ
 'σθ' B
 κατὰ B cett.
 τὰς γεν. τρ. Vulg.
- γρ. οὖν Laur. lxxxv, 9: δὴ Schanz
 εὔρυθμον in Marg. L

- A 3 ἤδη ALO ἡ δὴ Aldina B
 A 5 τὸ παρὰ O et fecit A¹ παρὰ ÷ ÷ A: παρὰ τὸ Schanz B
 (τὸ s. v.)
 A 6 ἀποδεξόμεθα (ut vid.).
 Corr. L et in Marg. O
 C 1 εἰ A om. O
 C 5 χορείαν A χορηγίαν O
 E 10 ἐρχομένης (ut vid.) li-
 bri ἐχομένης Stephanus B
- 655 C 1 χαίρομεν fecit A¹ χαίρωμεν (ut vid.) A
 C 3 λέγωμεν A (ut vid.) LO λέγομεν fecit A¹ B
 656 A 6 λέγεις AO¹ λέγεις L (ut vid.) OB
 B 3 παιδιᾶς fecit A¹ παιδείας A
 D 8 συνηθείας A (sed ηθεί in
 ras. A¹ συνουσίας Schanz
- 657 A 1 τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ τέχνῃ conj. τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ τέχνην B cett.
 Richards
 A 9 om. ἀνδρὸς with libri ἀνδρὸς Eus. B
 B 4 πον with libri τοῦ Aldina B
 C 3 λέγωμεν A (ut vid.) LO λέγομεν fecit A¹ B
 D 3 παιδιᾶ O et fecit A¹ παιδεία A (ut vid.)
 D 8 οἰώμεθα fecit A¹ (cum οἰώμεθα AO
 Vat. 1029)
 E 4 om. γε with A γε OB
 661 C 6 ποιήσετε ALO πείσετε Eus. B
 D 1 κακὰ O Eus. Jambl. et καλὰ A
 in Marg. a¹
- 663 B 8 εἰ μὴ L (ut vid.) δ' εἰ μὴ AO: δὲ τὴν al.: δ' ἡμῖν Al-
 dina
 C 5 παντὶ γρ. πάντῃ in Marg. a¹
 E 1 ποιεῖν om. ποιεῖν B: πείθειν ποιεῖν ci. Ste-
 phanus
 E 2 om. πάντας libri πάντας Eus. B
- 664 D 6 τρεῖς conj. Richards τρίτους B cett.
- 665 A 2 ἁρμονία LO ἁρμονίας A et fecit O¹ (σ s. v.)
 A 8 οἱ . . . χοροὶ. Richards δ . . . χορὸς B cett.
 conj. ὁ before τῶν
 B 7 δὲ δεῖ A et corr. O δεῖ δὴ O: δὴ δεῖ B
 666 B 1 τὸν νέον A¹ των νεων ut vid. A

- D 3 ἡ alterum om. Arm. ἡ libri
secluserit B
- D 4 om. δεῖ
- D 9 ἦν Aldina
- D 10 γενόμενοι A
- 667 C 2 ὥσπερ καὶ
D 1 ἐξεργάζονται A
E 6 παιδείαν A (ut vid.)
- 668 A 1 ἡ μή τις
B 6 φαμεν A et in Marg. O
D 9 τὸ τοιόνδε οἶον τοὺς δ
E 7 ἡ τὸ πεπλασμένον
- 669 A 3 om. ἄν. So Richards
A 9 ὅ τι Boeckh
- 669 C 4 καὶ μέλος ἀποδοῦναι
D 4 add τούτοις bef. ὅσους. So Richards
- 670 B 10 αὐτοῖς ut vid.
- 671 B 1 γενομένων οἱ γιγνομένων
libri
- 671 D 1 τὸν μὴ libri
- 672 A 2 ἀφηγοῖντο A
B 5 ἐμβάλλειν LO et fecit A¹
- 673 E 5 μελέτη Eus.
- 674 A 4 τῶν cett.
A 6 ὑδροποσίᾳ Stob.
- A 7 δούλην μήτε δούλον A
B 7 ἐν οἷς
- 676 A 5 εἰς (ut vid.) A
B 7 ἀπειρον A
- 677 A 9 ποτε
C 2 ἄρδην LO Eus. et γρ. α¹
C 7 πῶς γὰρ κτλ. Kliniae
tribuit Vulg.
D 7 ἀρ' ἴστ' AO
- E 6 λέγομεν in Marg. Cod.
Voss.
- 678 B 3 ἡ AL et in Marg. γρ. O ἡ καὶ O
- δεῖ B : δὴ Stephanus : δεῖ Schanz
τὴν libri
γενομένοις O et fecit A¹ (σ s. v.)
καὶ B cett.
ἐξεργάζονται A¹ O¹ (ο s. v.)
παιδιάν A¹ B
ἡ εἴ τις in Marg. Cod. Voss.
ἔφαμεν O
Extra versum A
in Marg. A¹ : om. A
ἄν B cett.
ὅ τε B cett.
in Marg. A¹ : om. A
ὅσους B cett.
αὐτῶν B cett.
λεγομένων Eus. B
τὸν Eus. B
ἀφίκοιντο LO
ἐμβάλλει AB
μελέτης libri
τῶν om. Eus.
ὑδροποσίαις A¹ L Eus. B : ὑδρο-
πωσίαις A
δούλον μήτε δούλην LO Eus. Stob.
ὥς Eus.
ἐπ' L (ut vid.) O
ἀπλετον LOB
om. Eus.
ἀρα ἦν A
ἀρ' οἶσθ' Vulg. : ἀριστ' in Marg.
Cod. Voss. B
λέγωμεν B cett.

- E 2 δέονται O et in Marg. γρ. λέγονται A et γρ. O
A²
- 679 B 8 γενναιότατα AL Stob. δικαιοτάτα LO
et γρ. LO
D 7 om. αὐτοῦ (Richards conj. αὖ) αὐτοῦ B cett.
- 680 A 6 om. λεγομένοις γρ. λειπομένοις O : λεγομένοις B cett.
- 680 E 3 ποιούσι ποιησι pr. A : Corr. A² (σου s. v.) : ποιήσουσι B cett.
- 681 A 2 τειχῶν τ' W-M. τειχῶν B cett.
- 681 B 5 ἀναιρέσεις libri ἂν αἰρέσεις Schneider B
- 682 E 4 τοὺς τότε φυγάδας O τὰς τότε φυγάς A et γρ. OB
- 683 A 8 πρὸ νῦν A et γρ. O νῦν L (ut vid.) OB
- 684 B 2 δῆμοι A δῆμον fecit A²
D 6 ἄλλαις scr. recc. ἀλλήλαις ALO
D 9 τῶν . . . E 1 κινεῖν in Marg. A² : om. A¹
- 685 C 7 σύνταξιν A² om. A (ut vid.)
D 2 ταύτην ALO ταῦτα Vulg. : ταῦτ' ἦν Schneider B
- 686 A 3 διακεκοσμησθαι A et γρ. O διακεκοσμημένους LO
- 687 C 10 ἄνδρες AL γρ. O ἄνδρες καὶ O
C 11 εὐχόμεθα LO εὐχοίμεθα A : εὐχοίμεθ' ἂν B
- 687 D 10 ἦ om. Arm. A sed s. v. ἦ B cett.
add A²
- E 7 μὴ or μηδὲν of ALO (δὲ γρ. πολὺ in Marg. ALO, B ÷ ÷ ÷ μηδὲν A).
- 688 B 1 καὶ om. Stob. καὶ B cett.
B 2 καὶ Stob. τὴν B cett.
B 4 ὁ λέγων ἐγὼ ὁ ἔλεγον ἐγὼ in Marg. O
C 6 προσῆκεν (or ? προσήκει) προσήκειν AO
scr. recc.
- E 6 εἴθ' A et pr. O εἰ τοῦθ' Stob. B
- E 7 ἀνοϊαν libri cum Stob. ignorantiam Ficinus
- 689 A 5 δόξῃ A² LO Stob. δόξαν scr. recc. (et forte pr. A) B
B 5 καὶ δὴ A Eus. Stob. δὴ O (sed γρ. καὶ)
C 4 ἂ ὁ Eus.
C 7 ταῦτα μαθαίνουσι ALO ταῦτ' ἀμαθαίνουσι in Marg. a²
Eus. B
- 690 A 2 ἐν τε οἰκίαις καὶ οἰκίαις Stob.
B 4 καὶ πέμπτον γε Stob. πέμπτον γε B cett.

- B 4 τὸν Stob.
 B 4 τὸν
 D 3 ὁ τι
 691 C 1 δύναμιν
 C 4 θείνει ut vid.

 C 5 λέγω. γρ. O
 D 5 ante νῦν distinxit
 D 6 τοπάσαι, τόδ' Vulg.
 D 8 εἶναι
 692 A 1 γήρας A et γρ. O
 B 7 μὲν οὔσαν ALO

 693 D 5 περσῶν
 694 B 4 τι A (sed εἷ s. v. A¹)
 B 6 ἀπέδωκεν libri
 C 4 add μέχρι bef. ἐφ' ὅπερ
 C 6 φιλόπολιν
 695 A 3 καὶ σκληρᾶς
 695 B 1 εἰκὸς αὐτοὺς (ut vid.). O
 C 7 τεθρυμμένος
 D 3 τὸν L (ut vid.) O
 D 7 ante ὧ praem. διὸ. ante ὧ
 lacunam statuit Badham
 E 6 εὐτυχῆς
 696 D 1 μὴ
 D 10 γεγωνὸς ἂν εἶην

 697 A 10 λέγωμεν A
 C 7 ἔτι (οἱ καὶ ἔτι) So W-M
 D 6 μισοῦνται
 698 A 9 πολιτείας
 C 1 τε AL Aristides et γρ. O
 E 4 ὕστερον (ut vid.) O
 699 C 5 ἡ καὶ
 C 6 θεὸς for δέος
 700 B 2 τούτῳ A
 E 3 om. ἂν. So Richards
- τὸ AOB
 om. pr. O Stob. et punctis not. A¹
 ὅσα LO: ὅτι A et in Marg. LOB
 om. Stob.
 θεῖ libri cum Stob. B: θεῖ ÷ ÷
 ÷ ÷ A: γρ. πίπτει in Marg.
 ALO
 λέγομεν B cett.

 τοπάσαι · τὸ δ' scripsit B
 οἶμαι Aldina
 ἀγορὰς O
 μένουσαν scr. Ven. 184 B and in
 Marg. a¹
 ÷ γένος A
 εἷς τι LO¹ B: εἷ τι O
 ἐπέδωκεν Stephanus B
 om. B cett.
 φιλόπονον Athenaeus
 σκληρὰν καὶ B cett.
 αὐτοὺς εἰκὸς AB
 τεθραμμένος B cett.
 τῶν A
 ὧ B cett.

 τύχης B cett.: τύχη Stephanus
 om. pr. AO (s. v. A¹)
 γεγωνὸς ἂν εἶη B cett. (÷ ÷ γε-
 γωνὸς A)
 λέγομεν L (ut vid.) O Stob. B
 ἐπὶ ἔτι B: ἐπὶ ἐπὶ ἔτι pr. A
 om. ut vid. pr. A
 πολιτείαν scr. recc.
 τότε O
 ὕστεροι A et Corr. OB
 καὶ ἡ Aristides

 τοῦτο LO
 ἂν B cett.

- 701 A 4 αὐτῇ L (ut vid.)
 A 5 ὑμῖν AO
 B 7 νομοθέτησιν AO
 D 2 om. either χάριν or ἔνεκα
 E 2 νῦν εἰ. So Richards
 E 6 ἀγαγόντων L (ut vid.)
 O et in Marg. γρ. A²
- 702 A 2 τούτων. Richards
- 705 A 6 τε
 B 1 πολύφορός τε εἶη καὶ πάμφορος LO Eus. Stob.
 B 7 τότε τε Richards
 C 5 τάντος (ut vid.). Badham
- 706 A 1 τῶν. γρ. a²
 A 2 καλῶν A
 A 2 om. μόνω
- 707 A 5 σωτηρίας Badham
- 708 A 3 γίγνεσθαι LO
- 708 C 1 τε καὶ νομοθεῖσθαι LO et in Marg. A² (ἐν ἄλλῳ εὖρον)
- 708 D 4 καθ' ἐν ci. Stallbaum
 D 6 ὄντως A et in Marg. LO
 D 7 τελεωτάτων Badham
 E 1 ἐπαινῶν A et Corr. O
- 709 A 8 ἄξειεν
 A 8 θνητὸν AO Stob.
 C 2 ἢ μὴ libri cum Stob. (Ecl.)
 C 7 μέλλει (ut vid.). Stob. (Flor.)
 D 2 παρὸν (ut vid.) A (ut vid.) O
- 710 C 2 πείθοι A
- 711 B 4 δεῖ A et εἰ s. v. O
 C 3 οἰώμεθα A² et Corr. O
- 712 B 2 παῖδες A
 B 5 ἀκούσας A
- ἐαυτῇ AO
 ἡμῖν B cett.
 νουθέτησιν LB
 χάριν ἔνεκα B (cum codd.)
 νυνὶ B cett.
 ἀγαθὸν τῶν A et γρ. O
 αὐτῶν B cett.
 om. Eus.
 πολύφορος A (sed πάμφορος fecit et reliqua extra vs. add. A²)
 τότε B cett.
 τὰ τῶν ἐντὸς B cett.
 τούτων A (ut vid.) LOB: τοῦ τῶν A² et γρ. O
 καλόν LOB
 σωτηρία B cett.
 γενήσεσθαι AB
 om. A
 καθ' ἓνα B cett.
 ὁμως LO et in Marg. γρ. a²
 τελεώτατον B cett.
 ἐπαινῶν O
 ἄρξειεν Stob.
 θνητῶν L
 om. Stob. (Flor.)
 μέλλοι AOB
 παρ' in Marg. L et γρ. O et (ex ras.) A²
 ἂν πείθοι O
 δὴ LO
 οἰώμεθα AO
 παῖδα LO
 ὑπακούσας LO (fort. ἐπακούσας)

- 713 A 3 του
A 3 ἀληθῶς AO et in Marg.
L
A 4 om. τὸν
B 3 ἀριστα οἰκεῖται A et in
Marg. LO
- 713 C 8 ἐφίστητο libri
D 6 γένους
E 2 ἐλευθερίαν LO et in
Marg. γρ. A²
E 6 ἀνάφυξις Julianus
- 714 B 7 καὶ τὸ LO
D 2 τύραννον (ut vid.) A et
in Marg. γρ. O
D 11 δικαιομάτων (ut vid.)
Winckelmann
- 715 C 7 δ' A²
D 6 οἱ θεοὶ Stob.
- 716 A 2 περιπορευόμενος libri etc.
A 4 ταπεινότητι and om. καὶ
κεκοσμημένος
- 716 A 4 ὁ δέ τις libri cum Clem.
Eus. Stob.
D 6 δεῖ libri
- 717 A 5 ἔφεσις
A 8 ἀριστεία AL et corr. O
E 1 τοῖς . . . γεννηταῖς.
Badham
- 718 A 3 δ' ἂν Stob.
D 4 λαβόμενα, μᾶλλον δ'.
Vulg.
- 719 A 2 φέρειν ALO
B 6 ποιεῖν A et in Marg. LO
E 4 μέτριον LO et fecit A²
(i s. v.)
- 721 A 1 πράξεσιν
721 B 2 δὲ in Marg. A²
B 6 ᾧ s. v. A²
- 722 A 2 αἰροίμην scr. recc.
- τὸ A: τοῦ L (ut vid.): τὸ τοῦ O
ἀληθοῦς L et corr. O
- secluserit Ast: ret. B
ἀριστοκρατεῖται LO
- ἐφίστη τότε Julianus
γένος B cett.
εὐνομίαν A et in Marg. LOB
- ἀνάφυξις B cett.
καὶ AB
τυραννίδα LO
- ἀδικημάτων libri: ἀξιωμάτων B
- om. A
θεοὶ B
- πορευόμενος [Ar.] de mundo
- εἰ δέ τις Plut. Theodoretus
- δὴ Vulg. δεῖ Schanz.
γρ. ἄφεσις in Marg. a²
ἀριστερά O (ut vid.)
τοὺς γεννητὰς B cett.
- ἂν B cett.
B om. μᾶλλον δέ: λαβόμενα in
Marg. γρ. A² (cum ind. ad μᾶλ-
λον δ') O²: μᾶλλον ÷ ÷ δ' A:
μᾶλλον δ' O (ut vid.)
πέλει scr. recc. cum Hesiodo
λέγειν LO
μέτρον A
- τάξεσιν B cett.
δὴ A
om. A
ἐροίμην ALO

- B 1 μήκιστα. conj. Richards μήκη B cett.
 B 4 τοῦτο LO τούτῳ A et in Marg. LO
- 723 D 2 om. ἅπασιν
 723 D 3 καὶ τῷ νομοθέτῃ Vulg. καὶ νομ. B cett.
 E 7 ἤδη s. v. A¹ om. A
- 726 A 1 ὅσπερ νῦν δὴ libri ὥσπερ νῦν Stob.
 A 2 τῶν αὐτοῦ libri τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ Stob.
 A 4 πάντ' ἐστὶ πᾶσιν libri παρὰ πᾶσι Stob.
 A 5 αὐτοῦ libri δύο Stob.
- 727 A 3 γάρ τι for γὰρ ἀγαθὸν που. γὰρ ἀγ. που B cett.
 Susemihl sec. ἀγαθὸν
- 727 B 7 ἐξαιρή Stob. ἐξαιρή libri
- 728 A 2 πάντως A Cornarius παντὸς A¹ O Stob. B
 A 2 λείπει AO Stob. λυπεῖ O¹ (v s. v.) Cornarius
 728 A 5 ὅσαπερ ἂν ὅς ἄπερ ἂν AOB: ὅσαπερ Stob.
 B 4 οὖσιν A Stob. om. Vulg.
 D 3 τιμῇ libri τιμῇ Aldina B
 D 6 μοι om. Stob. retain B cett.
- 729 C 7 γενέσθαι οὖς libri γενεθλίου Stob. B
 D 1 εὐμενεῖς ALO εὐμενὲς Stob.
 D 4 τε libri om. Stob.
 E 4 τὰ A¹ O¹ om. AO Stob.
- 730 A 7 ἔτυχεν libri ÷ ÷ ἔτυχεν A
 B 5 ὅς ἂν libri ὅσα Ast B
 B 6 καὶ εὐμενεῖς libri om. Stob.
 D 7 ἀρετῇ ἀρετῆς Julianus
- 731 A 5 κωλύων LO κολούων A et fecit O¹ B
 A 7 πρὸς εἰς Stob.
 C 1 αὖ τῶν αὐτῶν A
 C 6 τιμώτατον, κτλ. om. A
 C 8 τὰ om. Stob.
- 732 B 3 δὲ δέι δέι Stob. B: δέι libri
- 733 D 7 ὧν πέρι ὧνπερ A
- 735 A 2 μεγάλας A et γρ. O τὰς LO Stob. B: τὰς μεγ. Vulg.
 A 4 σμικράς Bücheler W-M σμικρᾶ B cett.
 A 5 κατάστασις A¹ O¹ καταστάσεις ALO Stob. B
 E 6 om. τῆς (ut vid.) A τῆς s. v. A¹ B
- 736 A 2 ἀπαλλαγῆς conj. Richards ἀπαλλαγὴν libri: secl. Wagner:
 ἀπαλλαγῇ Ast
 A 5 ἀποπώτερα libri ἀκοπώτερα Ritter B

- A 7 om. *ἐκ* Madvig
 B 5 *πολιτικῇ κατασκευῇ* Stob.
 B 5 *τὰ δ' (or? τὰδε δὲ)* Stob.
 D 4 *ἡ δὲ τῶν libri*
 D 5 *ὑπάρχειν libri*
 E 7 *τῆς μεταβάσεως*
 737 A 2 *οὐδεμία libri*
 A 7 *ἡμῖν*
 B 1 om. *δεῖ*
 B 3 *οἷς ἡ*
 B 5 *κοινήν* A et γρ. O
 C 2 *αὐτὸν LO*
 C 4 *αὐτοῖς libri*
 C 7 *πρὸς τὰς ALO*
 D 1 *γῇ LO*
 E 3 *διανεμηθέντων Vulg.*
 738 A 1 *τίς* A et in Marg. γρ. O
 A 2 *λέγωμεν* A et in Marg. O
 739 B 2 *ποιῶμεν AO*
 B 4 *ἂν εἴποτε A*
 740 B 3 *ἐστίαί A² (a s. v.)*
 B 6 *πᾶσαν AL*
 D 1 *ἀρχή Schanz*
 D 6 *οἷς ut vid. A²*
 E 8 *δ' O*
 741 A 3 *ὑπερβάλλειν* A et in Marg.
 γρ. LO
 B 5 *κλῆρος* A (sed σ in ras.)
 O
 C 3 *εὐχὰς* L (ut vid.) O
 D 4 *τὸ (ut vid.) A² (s. v.)*
 743 A 3 *διαφόρως ALO Origen.*
 Stob.
 B 1 *κτημάτων* A et corr. LO
 B 4 *οὐκ ἀγαθὸς* L (ut vid.) O
 743 B 4 *πάγκακος* L (ut vid.) O
 D 2 *εἶναι χρυσὸν* O (sed εἶναι
 punctis not.) Stob.
 744 C 2 *πενίας O*
- ἐκ* B cett.
κατ. πολ. B cett.
τάδ' ALO: ἀλλ' Vulg.
ἡδε, τῶν Bekker B
ὑπάρχει Aldina
τῆς ÷ ÷ μετ. A.
οὐδεμῶ Bekker B
γρ. λιμὴν O
δὴ A et corr. O: δεῖ OB
οἷς ἡ libri
καινήν L (ut vid.) O et γρ a² B
αὐτῶν A: αὐτῶν Boeckh B
αὐτοῖς Hermann B
τὰς Vulg.
γῇ A: γῆς Aldina
διανεμηθέντων B
καὶ τίς LO
λέγομεν LO
ποιοῦμεν LO²
ἂν δὴ ποτε LO: δεῖ ποτε B
ἐστι A
πᾶσαν τὴν O
ἀρχὴν A (sed ex emend.) LOB
om. A
τ' AO² (s. v.) B
παρεμβάλλειν LOB
κλῆρον A² O²
εὐχαῖς AO² (aῖς s. v.)
om. A
διαφερόντως scr. recc.
χρημάτων LO
οὐ κακὸς A (in Marg. οὐ κακὸς ἀπ'
ὀρθώσεως O) B
πάγκαλος A et fecit O² (λ s. v.)
χρυσὸν ALB
πενίαν A et fecit O² (ν s. v.) B

- C 6 καὶ ante τετάρτους s. v. A¹ om. A
 D 4 νοσήματος LO Stob. νομίσματος A et in Marg. LO
 D 6 ἀμφοτέρων L ἀμφοτέρα AO Stob.
 D 7 δεῖ A δὴ O
 E 1 δεῖ O δὴ A
 745 A 2 θεοῖς . . . C 3 κλήρους δὲ om. A
 B cett.
 C 6 ἐκατέρων ἐκάτερον libri B: ἐκατέρου Ast
 D 4 πλήθει LO πάθει A
 D 5 δὴ A δεῖ LO
 D 7 καὶ μετὰ A et γρ O καὶ τὸ μετὰ LO
 746 A 6 εἰρήκαμεν O¹ (αμ s. v.) εἶρηκεν ALOB
 A 8 ἔχει δὴ in Marg. A¹ νο- σχεδὴ A
 luit a
 B 1 δ' ἐπαναλαμβάνειν LO δὲ πάντα λαμβάνειν A
 B 6 τόδε O τόνδε AL et fecit O¹ (v s. v.)
 C 6 ἐκείνου ἐκείνους O et (ut vid.) pr. A
 D 3 τὴν δόξασαν τὴν . . . δι- conj. τῆς δοξάσης England
 ανομήν
 D 4 post τρόπον distinxit
 Ast B
 E 1 ἀγωγὰς ἀγῶνας fecit A¹
 E 3 νομοθέτην O¹ (θέτην s. νόμον AOB
 v.)
 747 C 3 σοφίας AO τῆς σοφίας L
 D 6 διελήσεις libri δι' εἰλήσεις Ruhnken B
 D 6 ἐξαίσιτοι Ast ἐναίσιτοι AO Stob. Phrynichus:
 ἀναίσιτοι O¹ (ἀ s. v.)
 D 7 διὰ Gal. δι' αὐτὴν Stob. B: διὰ ταύτην libri
 E 4 τοὺς L (ut vid.) O τοῖς A
 751 C 8 αὐτοὺς A αὐ τοὺς B
 C 9 om. τε Secl. Stallbaum B τε cett.
 D 1 τοὺς ALO τὸ Aldina B
 D 7 om. φασὶν libri φασὶν B et Schol. T ad Crat.
 421 E
 752 A 2 γὰρ ἄν LO ἄν A et in Marg. LO
 A 3 πάντη ἀπάντη B libri: ἀπαντι Heindorf:
 Secl. Hermann
 C 7 χρόνον χρόνον ὄν ALO (sed ὄν punct.
 not. O)

- D 5 ἦν . . . κατοικίζετε L (ut vid.) ἦν . . . κατοικίζεται AO (sed ε supra αι O²): ἦ . . . κατοικίζεται A² ιστώσιν Hermann B
 D 7 στῶσιν libri
 E 1 δ' ἡμῖν Hermann B
 753 B 1 om. οὖν (ut vid.) οὖν A²BO²: νῦν AO
 754 A 4 γε γρ. O om. A (in ras.): τε O (sed punct. not.)
 B 1 κατοικισθεισῶν L (ut vid.) et fecit O² et in Marg. κατοικισέων A: κατοικισθέντων fecit A² (add. θ et ντ s. v.)
 a
 B 2 κατοικισάσαις scr. recc. κατοικησάσαις A² (κη s. v.) LO: κατοισασαις A
 B 4 παιδείας libri παιδίας B
 C 2 λέξω λέγω B cett.
 C 2 δὴ L et γρ. O γε A (in ras.) O
 755 C 1 ὑπηρέτας A² O² (et s. v.) ὑπηρεσίας AOB: ὑπάρχους al.
 E 1 ἐκάστη φυλακῇ ἐκ. φυλῇ L (ut vid.) Eus. B: ἐκάστη φυλακὴ AO
 756 A 6 ἀντιβολὴν libri ἀντι<προ>βολὴν B Ast.
 757 A 2 ἰσοτιμίαις (ut vid.) ἴσαις τιμαῖς B cett.
 757 A 2 διαγορευόμενοι libri διαγενόμενοι Boethus
 E 5 αὐτοῖς Richards αὐτοὺς B cett.
 758 D 2 διὰ ALO δι' α B Winckelmann: διὸ Vulg.
 759 B 8 ἱερῶν libri ἱερέων B Stob.
 C 5 αὐτῶν γρ. O (ἀπ' ὀρθώσεως) αὐτὸν ALO Stob. B
 759 C 6 δὲ χρὴ νόμους L (ut vid.) γρ. δευτερην (sic) in Marg. A² (quod ipsum pr. A habuisse videtur): in Marg. etiam χρὴ νό-
 O (in ras.) et fecit a (δὲ χρὴ νό in ras.) <μους> περὶ τὰ θεῖα A²
 England notes: "Here again L seems alone to have avoided the extraordinary blunder of δευτέρην for δὲ χρὴ νό-." The Arm proves that the blunder was not in the true tradition of A.
 D 5 τρεῖς AO Stob. τρεῖς B in Marg. A² et fecit O² (ι s. v.)

- 760 B 7 δωδέκατον: δωδεκάτῳ fecit δώδεκα τῶν A (ut vid.) LOB
 A² et in Marg. γρ. O: ἀλλα-
 χού · δωδέκατον πέντε ἐκ τῶν
 νέων in Marg. L
 E7 ἐνοικοδομήμασιν B Schnei- ἐν οἰκοδομήμασιν libri
 der
- 761 A 3 τοῖς μὲν τοῖς scripsit B: ἐν τοῖς AO
 (sed ἐν punct. not. in O)
 C 3 ἄλσος L (ut vid.) O² et δάσος A et fort. O
 in Marg. γρ. A²
 D 3 δ' ἔξιν libri δέξιν B Winckelmann
 B cett. omit second ἡ
- 762 A 3 ἡ καὶ δίκας ἡ ἀδίκως So γρ. in Marg. O
 B 3 τούτων πέρι λαγχάνειν τούτῳ περιλαγχάνειν A
 B 4 δίκας AO δίκαις L (ut vid.) A² (is. v.) O² B
 E 1 δὴ δὲ Stob.
 763 C 4 ἀστυνόμων ἦν ἡμῖν ἀστ. πέρι ἦν ἡμῖν B. For πέρι ἦν
 A and A² in Marg. have the im-
 possible τρεῖν: a has ἦν in ras.
 and ἦν ἡμῖν in Marg. B regards
 τρεῖν as a corruption of πέρι ἦν
 but πέρι has already been ex-
 pressed after ἀγορανόμων
- 764 C 7 παιδείας . . . ἀγωνιστικῆς om. AO: add in Marg. A² O²
 C 7 αὐτῶν A² O² αὐτῆς L
 E 6 ἱκανῶς ALO ἱκανὸς A² B
- 766 A 4 πάντων ὅποσα < τῶν > ὅποσα B following F.
 A. Wolf
 B 1 προστάττειν ALO προστάτην καὶ Aldina
 B 4-5 κάλλιστον . . . γενό- κάλλιστ' ἂν . . . γενομένων B cett.
 μενον (Hug. rejects γενομένων)
 C 5 μέλον AO μέλλον A² (in Marg.) O²
 D 8 δὲ δαί τὸ δὲ αἰὲ τὸ ALOB: δὴ τό γε in Marg.
 O²
- 767 B 6 τὴν δίκην L δίκην AOB
 C 1 δ' post λακτέον add. O² om. B cett.
 C 2 ἡμῖν A et in Marg. γρ. O om. O
 D 1 ὀνομόσαντας ALO ὀνόσαντας scr. recc. B
 E 7 ὁ, τι ὅτι B cett.

- E 8 τούτων ALO
 E 9 δημοσίων
 768 A 8 αὐτοῖς (or? ἀλλήλοις) L
 et in Marg. γρ. O
 D 7 τὸ τέλος O
 769 C 2 τὸ ante φανλότερον add. O²
 C 3 om. αἰ
 C 4 καταδείξει for καταλείψει,
 an error due to reading δ
 for λ in an uncial text.
 770 D 3 ἔθους. γρ. O
 D 6 τεταγμένη libri
 E 7 ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν A²
 771 B 3 φῦναι a (? φύειν)
 B 5 ἱερὸν Stephanus
 772 B 5 χρόνος in Marg. A² O²
 772 E 1 τὰς AO
 E 2 ἐτῶν A²
 773 C 6 καὶ βραδυτέρους in Marg.
 A²
 C 7 θυμὸν ἂν ἐγείραι Ast
 774 C 4 τὸ AO
 C 5 γηράσκειν ALO
 D 2 om. ἡ bef. διδοῦς: W-M
 conj. καὶ
 D 5 τῷ διὰ A
 E 7 μὴ τύχη
 775 E 2 om. καὶ bef. θεός. W-M
 "Das καὶ muss fort."
 776 B 6 κεκτηῖτο (ut vid.) Ast
 C 3 τὰ λεγόμενα in ras. O
 777 E 5 αἰ Vulg.
 778 C 5 om. πρὸς τοῖς ὑψηλοῖς. So
 γρ. O
 D 1 add. ὡς bef. καὶ τοιούτων
 E 3 τὰ δὲ ταφρεύοντας in
 Marg. A² O²
 E 8 τὰς ψυχὰς
- τούτῳ B Aldina
 γρ. κοινῶν in Marg. A² O²
 αὐτοὶ AOB
 τέλος A et in Marg. γρ. OB
 om. B cett.
 αἰ AOB: δὴ in Marg. γρ. O
 ἔθους B cett.
 τεταμένη B Stephanus
 ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν A
 φῦν AB
 ἱερὰν B cett.
 χορὸς ALO
 πᾶς L (ut vid.) O² B
 των A
 om. A
 θυμὸν * * ἀνεγείραι AO
 τῷ Vulg.
 διδάσκειν in Marg. LO
 B cett. ἡ (Arm. also adds *isk* ? =
 μὲν after διδοῦς)
 τῷ δημοσίῳ LO et in Marg. A² B
 τύχη B: τύχη fecit A²
 καὶ B cett.
 κέκτητο libri
 καὶ λεγόμενα BA (sed τὰ s. v. A²
 et καὶ τὰ λεγ. in Marg. a)
 δεῖ Athen. Stob.: δ' αἰ AO
 B cett. retain
 om. AO
 ταῖς ψυχαῖς B cett.

- 779 B 7 ἕως libri
 B 7 μὲν ἧ libri
 E 2 πολλῶν in Marg. A^s
- 780 B 6 ὑπὸ πολλῆς ἀπορίας (sed
 λῆς ἀ ref. A^s)
 C 7 νῦν δὲ Hermann
 E 1 εἶπον in Marg. A^s
- 781 A 2 ἄλλο libri
 C 2 ἔργῳ γε. So Richards
 C 6 δεδουκὸς A
 D 1 ὥσπερ
- E 6 χρόν L (ut vid.) O (in
 ras.) et in Marg. γρ. A
- 782 B 6 μῶν ref. A^s
 C 3 ἐτολμῶμεν libri
 D 2 λεγόμενα α τ' libri
- 783 A 4 τρέποντα AO
 B 1 σβεννύντων
 B 2 παίδων . . . D 4 καλῶς
 om. with AO
- 784 C 1 οἶδε ALO
 D 6 γενέσια τῶν (ut vid.) A
 or γενέθλια τῶν B
 E 3 ἔτι
- 785 A 5 ἀρχή AL et in Marg. O
 A 5 post κόρη dist. Vulg.
- 789 A 1 χαλεπῶν
 789 E 1 φράζωμέν τι
 E 2 γενησόμενον
- 790 B 3 ὀρθῶς Vulg.
 E 3 ἱασις. So F. H. D.
- 791 A 4 φαίνεσθαι ALO
 B 5 αὐτοῖς libri
 C 4 ἀρετὴν Badham and W.
 R. Paton
 D 2 δεῖ AO
 D 2 καὶ LO^s
 D 7 τούτων
- ὥς B
 μένη B Schneider
 om. A
 ὑπὸ πολανσαπορίας in Marg. A^s
 νῦν τε B cett.
 ἡπόρει (sed ἡ et εἰ ref. A^s): εἶπορι
 in Marg. A^s
 ἀλλ' ὁ Stephanus B
 γε ἔργῳ B cett.
 δεδουκὸς O et fecit A^s
 ὅπερ B Bekker: οἶπερ ALO: ἦπερ
 scr. recc.
 χρόνον A: χρεὼν Schanz
 in Marg. μον A^s
 ἐτόλμων μὲν B Schanz
 λεγόμενά τ' B ci. Bekker
 πρέποντα L
 σβεννύναι Aldina
 retain L et in Marg. A^s O^s
 οἱ δὲ B
 γενέσεων or γενεθλίων cett.
 γρ. ἀρτι O
 ἀρχήν O (ex emend.)
 post ἀρχή distinxit B
 συμμέτρων B cett.
 om. τι B cett.
 γενόμενον B cett.
 ὀρθῆς ALOB
 ἱάσεις B cett.
 φαίνεται scr. recc.
 αὐτοῖς B Ritter
 ἀρετῆς B cett.
 δη A^s (η s. v.) O^s B
 om. AO
 τούτου Stob.

- E 5 γεννώμενον O et fecit A² γενόμενον AB
 E 6 τὸ A τῷ fecit A²B
 792 B 4 τρί' ἔτη O (ut vid.) τριετῇ AL et γρ. O
 C 3 διαφθορὰ L (ut vid.) et διαφορὰ AO
 fecit O² (θ s. v.)
 E 6 ἰλεων λείον Stob.
 E 6 εὐμενὲς L (ut vid.) Stob. εὐμενῶς AO
 et fecit O²
 E 7 διαζήσει διασώζει Stob.
 793 A 3 ἀκρατοῦς ἀκράτου B cett.
 793 D 7 τριετῇ ALO τρι' ἔτη B Bekker
 E 6 ἐλέγομεν Stephanus λέγομεν ALO
 793 E 7 add. μὴ ἀτίμως bef. ὀργὴν
 794 A 1 τρυφήν L et fecit O² (ἡ τρυφᾶν AO
 s. v.)
 A 5 τῶν A om. O
 B 2 ἄς ALO ὥς L²
 D 7 χεῖρας in Marg. L; Eng- χρείας ALO
 land supposes that Ficino
 conjectured χεῖρας in mg. of L
 D7 τὰ περὶ ἕκαστα τῶν τὰ κατὰ τῶν A: τὰ κάτω τῶν LOB
 795 D3 δεῖ LO δὴ A sed ἡ ex emend.
 E 2 φυλαττόντων ut vid. in φυλάττοντας B ceteri
 Marg. cod. Voss.
 795 E 5 om. καὶ Aldina seclussit καὶ B libri
 Hermann
 E 5 ἀποδιδούσα Hermann ἀποδιδομένης B libri
 Arm. has stop after ἀπο-
 διδούσα
 796 A 6 ἀντιστάσεως καταστάσεως B cett.
 796 B 7 παιδιᾷ παιδείᾳ Eus.
 D 5 after κλεινία remove B cett. begin a fresh period at
 stop. So W-M ἣν εἶπον
 E 6 τὰ L (ut vid.) τε AO
 797 A 1 om. δέ: Richards conj. δὴ
 797 B 1 after κατὰ om. τὰ ut vid. τὰ B cett.
 AO
 B 5 ταῦτα A ταῦτα B cett.
 C 8 αὐτ' αὐτ' A

- E 3 δὲ Stob.
 E 4 παραχθέντα
 798 A 4 τό γε A
 D 7 οἷς AO
 799 B 1 τινὰς ci. Stephanus
 B 1 om. δ' AO
 800 A 3 οὖν in ras. A¹
 B 5 τοιόνδε τι libri
 B 6 ἀσφαλέστατα O
 E 2 βαρβαρικῇ καὶ καρικῇ
 801 B 10 πάνυ Badham
 C 2 τοῦτό τι
 E 3 γίγνουντ' O¹
 802 C 1 ἐν τισιν ci. Stallbaum
 C 4 πᾶσα δ' ἄτακτος L et in
 Marg. A¹ et in textu fecit a
 D 1 om. δὲ secl. Hermann
 E 3 ἀπάδειν O¹ (d s. v.)
 E 4 order ἐκάστοις τούτων L
 E 6 ἀνάγκη A
 E 7 θηλειῶν O¹ et in Marg.
 A¹ in textu a (θη s. v.)
 803 D 6 ὁ Hermann
 804 A 4 τοῦτον A et γρ. O
 D 1 οἰκοῦντας AO Eus.
 E 4 οὐκ ἔτι (Richards conj.
 οὐκ αὖ)
 805 A 5 ἀνοητότατα scr. recc.
 805 B 5 εἰπὼν
 D 7 τῆς
 806 A 3 om. δὲ
 B 4 γε O¹ (γ s. v.)
 806 C 3 οὐχὶ ἤμουν ut vid. Stall-
 baum
 C 5 ἀτάκτως ALO
 E 5 δὲ AO
 δ' αὖ B cett.
 ταχθέντα in Marg. A¹
 τότε LO Stob.
 ἐν οἷς O¹
 τινὰς A
 δ' A¹ O¹ B
 ου (ut vid.) A
 τοιόνδ' ἔτι B Bekker
 ἀσφαλέστατον B cett.
 καρικῇ B cett.
 πᾶν B cett.
 τοῦτο B cett.
 γίγναιτ' ALO
 τισιν B cett.
 πασατατακτος (ut vid.) A: πᾶσα
 δ' ἀτάκτως L¹ O
 δὲ B cett.
 ἐπάδειν AO
 τούτ. ἐκ. AB; τούτ. ἐκ. τούτων O
 ἀνάγκη Vulg.
 λειῶν AO
 τὸ libri
 ταῦτόν OB
 οὐκ ὄντας in Marg. et in textu
 fecit A¹
 οὐκ ἂν B cett.
 ἀνόητα ALO
 εἶπον Vulg.
 τις A: corr. A¹
 δέ τινα B libri: δὴ τινα Ast.
 δὲ AO
 οὐ δι' ἡμουν LO. But Arm. is
 doubtful and turned ἡμουν δεῖν
 into οἶμαι συνιδεῖν and so three in-
 ferior MSS. read οὐδ' ἱημουν συνιδεῖν:
 οὐ διήμουν B following Stallb.
 ἀτάκτοις L¹ O¹
 τε O¹ (τ s. v.)

- E 7 ξυσσιτίων libri
 E 7 ταῦτα πείσαντας cf. L
 807 B 1 καταπεπιασμένῳ L
 B 2 τετραχυσμένων

 B 7 τὰ δὲ
 808 A 5 αὐτοὺς AO
 A 7 πάντα
 C 2 καλῶς A Stob.
 D 7 θηρίον Stob. et fecit O²
 (o s. v.)
 E 2 παιδείας A (sed δει ex
 emend.) pr O
 E 6 καὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον Vulg.
 809 A 2 οἷς O²
 A 6 τοῦτον O²
 B 7 χρή σοι Schneider
 C 6 εἴ τινα
 D 1 δὴ L (ut vid.)
 D 2 τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν γρ. O
 D 7 οὕτω Vulg.
 810 A 4 παρὰ νόμον Ficino "con-
 tempta lege"
 B 1 μάνθανε ALO
 D 5 ὀλίγα L

 D 9 om. δ' AO
 E 9 δεινοὶ AO²
 811 A 2 ταῦτ' A
 B 5 πολυμάθειαν fecit A²
 C 7 δεῦρο δὴ (sed η refic-
 tum) LO
 D 5 τε L (ut vid.) A² (τ
 s. v.) O²
 E 1 πον A
 E 4 λόγων ALO
 812 C 1 συντάσεις L et fecit O²
 812 C 2 μίμησιν A ex emend.
- ξυσσίτων B Schulthess
 ταῦτα σπείσαντας AOB
 καταπεπιεσμένῳ AO
 τετρυχωμένων B codex Riccardi-
 anus: τετρυφωμένων ALO: τετρυ-
 μένων A² O² et in Marg. A²
 τατα δὲ A: ταῦτα δὲ fecit A²
 αὐτοὺς LB
 πάντας B cett.: πάντως Stob.
 καλὸς LO et fecit A²
 θηρίων B cett.

 παιδίας B cett.

 om. τὸν ALOB
 οἷ AO
 τούτων AO
 χρήσοι ALO
 ἔτι τὰ ALOB: γρ. τίνα δὲ LO
 δεῖ AO
 τὸν ἐνιαυτόν B cett.
 οὕπω B cett.
 B cett. παράνομον

 μανθάνειν L² O²
 ὀλίγου AO et in Marg. L:
 ὀλίγον Hermann
 δ' L (ut vid.) et γρ. OB
 δειν οἱ O et fecit A² B.
 ταῦτόν B cett.
 γρ. φιλομαθ O
 δεῦρ' αἰ Lex. Bachm.

 δὲ AO

 νόμων O² (ν et μ s. v.)
 συστάσεις AOB
 κίνησιν pr. A (ut vid.) O

- (in Marg. iterat A³) L et
 γρ. O
 E 1 καὶ ἀντίφωνον in marg. om. AO
 A³ O²
- 813 C 4 τοσούτων τοσούτον A
 D 2 συννοῶν for συνὼν B ceteri
 Apelt.
 D 3 μὴ δέ μηδε A: μηδὲν fecit A²
 D 7 τιθῶμεν L² cum Eus. τίθεμεν B cett.
- 814 A 3 τοῦ φυλάξοντα ci. τοὺς φυλάξοντα L (ut vid.) B:
 Schneider τοὺς φυλάξαντα AO
 A 6 βιασιότερα βία B libri: γρ. βιαία O
 B 6 καταχεῖν A² κατασχεῖν A
 D 7 περὶ τῆς Ast. Wagner τῆς B cett.
 conj.
- 815 A 6 after ἀκοντίων add. ἄλ- B cett. om.
 λων τε ταύταις ἐπομένων cf.
 C 3
- 815 C 4 for κατῳνωμένους ἡλλοι- W-M. "dass die Götter be-
 ωμένους οἱ μεταμεμορφωμέ-
 νους trunken sind, ist doch zu
 D 5 δὲ τῆς ALO stark." He conj. κατῳνωμένοι
 D 6 τιμῶν (ut vid.) L τιμώντων AOB
 E 3 ἐπαύξης ἐπ' αὐξῆς A
- 816 B 4 πρὸς τὰς L (ut vid.) πρὸς τὰς περὶ AO
 D 4 οἷας L (ut vid.) O² οἷα AO
 D 7 τούτου A τούτων B cett.
 E 2 om. αὖ or ἄν ἄν libri: αὖ scr. B
- 817 A 6 δέδοκται A² δεδεικται (ut vid.) A
 D 1 μή τις οὖν ἡμῶν ἡγισοῦν ὑμῖν B cett.
- 818 C 2 ὥς ἀδύνατος οἷος δυνατός B cett.
 E 10 ἀποκρυπτόμενος A (sed ἀποκαμπτόμενος (ut vid.) A
 ρυ in ras.) (καμ in marg. A²)
- 819 D 2 ἄνοιαν libri ἄγνοιαν B Ast.
- 820 A 3 ἡρέμα L (ut vid.) O² ρημα AO: ῥητὰ in marg. A²:
 ῥήματα in textu fecit a (τα s. v.)
 A 8 om. ὥστε πῶς punct. retain AO: B brackets: Secl.
 not. A² W-M.

- 820 D 5 ἅμα μανθανόμενα fecit αμανθανομενα A
A²
- 821 A 8 τόδε libri τὸ δὲ B Schneider
- 821 B 7 δὴ AO δὴ λέγεις O²
- C 5 ταῦθ' ἃ fecit A² παντα A (Arm. tr. after αἰ)
E 3 ἀκήκοα A² (a s. v.) ἀκηκοὺς AB: ἀκήκοας O
E 4 σφῶν ἃ O et fecit A² σφῶν ἃν AO²: σφῶν ἃν B
822 B 4 om. μὲν ὥς . . . B 5 in Marg. add. A², ret. B
τάχιστον om. A
- 822 C 1 Arm. read: ἄρ' οὐκ οἰόμεθα γελοῖόν τι καὶ . . . γίγνεσθαι. Klinias: γελοῖον μέν. Plato: οὐδαμῶς κτλ. Ficino also introduces Klinias from γελοῖον to C 6 ταῦτ' ἐστίν
- 822 D 5 νομοθέτῃ L (ut vid.) νομοθετεῖν A (sed εἰν in ras.): νομοθέτην O
- D 5 καὶ μείζον τι ἐπὶ μείζον B
- D 5 τοὺς libri τοῦ B Aldina
- D 6 ἀπαλλάττεσθαι L ἀπηλλάχθαι AO et in Marg. L, B
- E 2 ῥητά (of libri) om. ἄρρητα B Hermann
- Arm.
- E 4 γεμειν ut vid. γέμειν in Marg. LOB: γε μὴν ALO
- E 9 νομοθέτου re vera AL om. Vulg.
- 823 A 1 ἀκήρατον B cett. ἄκρατον
- A 3 δεῖ L (ut vid.) O² δὴ AO
- A 7 δημοῖ μὲν Vulg. δημοῖμεν AB
- B 5 ἄξιον O² ἀξίαν AOB
- C 1 aft. στρατοπέδοις add ἀπαντήσεις or similar
- E 5 ? τὸ Winckelmann τὸν B cett.
- 824 A 4 ἥ τοι ut vid.: ἥ τῶν libri: ἥττον B
- A 6 λῴστη for λοιπὴ
- A 11 ἱερούς γρ. in Marg. ἱερεῖς ALO
LO

A 13 *κυσὶν libri**ἄρκυσι* Grou BA 16 *ἀγίοις* Vulg.*ἀγρίοις* ALO B

The detailed comparison in the above pages with the critical apparatus of Professor Burnet of the Armenian version sufficiently reveals the tradition and affinities of the Greek codex used by the translator about A. D. 1000. In order to economize space I omit for the last five books to copy from Burnet in each case the Greek authorities for or against each of the Armenian variants, assuming that my reader can refer to his edition and verify them for himself from his notes.

The readings then vouched for by the version in these last five books are as follows:

828 A 2 *αἵτινες*] *ἄστινας*. om. *θυσῖαι*. A 4 *γίγνοιτ'* ut vid.828 C 4 *μοίραις*. C 7 om. *τῶν*. C 8 *ἐπόμενον*. D 6 *διάνοιαν*829 A 2 *μήθ'* *ἑαυτοὺς ἀδικεῖν* omitting *ἄλλους*. B 1 *προγυμναστέον*.E 2 *ὄντα*830 B 4 *περιελούμεθα*. C 2 *ἐρημία*. C 9 *διαμαχόμενον* ut vid.D 1 *καὶ* (post *ψυχῆς*). D 7 om. *τε καὶ ἐλάττους* (om. Ficino secl. Hermann). E 4 *ἀληθῶν*831 B 6 *τι σμικρά*. E 6 *ἔᾶσαι* for *ἔῶσα*832 B 10 *οὖν*. D 3 *γίγνοιτ'*833 A 8 *ὄπλα ἔχων*. D 3 *μενούσαις*. D 4 *ταύταις ἐσταλμέναις* ut vid.E 3 *ἢ μὴ*834 A 1 *διακρινεῖ* (Richards). A 5 *λίθοις*. B 7 *ἀγωνίας* or *ἀγωνίαν* for *ἀγωνιστάς*. B 8 *δοκεῖν*] *προσδοκᾶν*. D 4 *ἄξια*. E 1 *διδασκάλοις* or *ὑπὸ διδασκάλων*835 D 4 *τι* or *ὅ, τι καὶ*. E 1 *ὑβριν*. E 3 *δὴ πολλὰ*836 A 2 *τὸ*. A 5 *πρὸς τούτοις* for *τ' αὐτούς*. B 2 om. *κακὰ*. B 4 *διαφυγὴν*. C 1 *πρὸ τοῦ Ααίου*. C 6 *καὶ*837 B 6 *τοῦτον*. C 3 *τοῦ*. C 5 *δεόντως*. D 1 *δὴ* (ut vid.). D 5 *τὸν νέον* (ut vid.). D 7 *λέγομεν*838 A 1 *τὴν . . . τὴν*. C 4 *λεγομένη*839 A 2 *βούλοιτ'*. A 7 *λύττης*. B 3 *τάχα*. C 1 *τῇ . . . τῇ*. C 7 *ποτε*840 A 1 om. *τε* or *γε*. A 1 om. *ὦν*. A 6 *τῶν*841 A 7 om. *ἦν*. C 7 *γίγνοιτο*. . . C 8 *πόλεσι* retain842 A 2 retain *τε καὶ οὐκ ὀρθῶς*. A 5 *ὁδε δὲ*. B 1 *μὴν*. B 3 *ἄλλως*. B 4 om. *δεῖν*

- 843 A 7 ὁ καταφρονήσας (Richards). B 2 γεωργοῖς
 844 D 6 παιδείαν. E 9 E 9 ἐπόμενος. E 9 νόμῳ
 845 B 1 τῶν τοιούτων. B 3 ἀϊστωρ ὦν. B 3 τὸν μὲν δοῦλον. D 5
 οὔτε ἥλιον. E 2 ἀλλότριον δν
 846 B 5 ἕκαστον οἱ ἐκάστους. C 8 μέτριον. D 1 τόδε. E 6 δι'
 847 D 4 στρατηγοὶ
 848 A 1 πράσιμα ἐν. A 4 αὐτῶν. A 4 εἴ τέ for οἱ τέ. A 5 ὅσαι
 χρειαί. B 8 τὸ τοῖς. C 1 λαβὼν and om. δ'. D 5 δέ. E 7
 μέρη for γένη. E 10 γεωργοῖσι
 849 A 3 δὴ ἀγορανόμοις τὰ περὶ ἀγοράν. A 5 τὸ δέ. B 1 δέ ἔστω.
 B 6 τῇ δεκάτῃ. C 2 αὐ τοῖς ut vid. C 2 om. καὶ. E 1 retain
 ται καὶ ὁπόταν βούλη. E 5 add θεῶν before θῶνται
 850 B 1 κατοικεῖν. B 6 ἐὰν δ' ἐντὸς τοῖς ἔτεσι τούτοις. C 6 μεινάτω

BOOK IX.

- 853 A 4 τὰ ante κατὰ (ut vid.). A 6 om. λεγόμενον. A 6 ὁραθὲν
 for ῥηθὲν. B 7 δέ (ut vid.). C 5 αὐτοί A. D 4 ἄτηκτοι.
 D 5 ἐπίχαριν ut vid. D 6 πέρι
 854 A 5 λέγοι. B 3 δέ τις and om. σέ. B 8 ὑμῖν. C 4 νόσημα
 855 A 1 om. παράδειγμα (Badham). A 1 om. καὶ (Richards).
 A 8 om. τῶν. B 6 αὐτὸν. C 2 ὑπερορίαν. C 6 γιγνέσθω. E 6
 ἀποδιδότω
 856 A 4 for αὐ τοῖς reads αὐτοῖς. B 2 ἄνθρωπον. B 3 ἐταιρείας.
 C 6 οἵπερ. C 7 ψῆφον (om. δέ). D 6 add ἡ bef. δέκα (Ast).
 E 4 om. καλῶς. E 8 μονῆς (om. περὶ)
 857 A 3 ἐπκείσθω. A 4 μιᾶς δίκης τιμωρία σύμπασιν. A 6 τοῦ
 κλήρου. B 9 τοι. C 1 ἕτερον. C 3 ὥστε. C 4 παρόντι. D 2
 χρώμενον ut vid.
 858 A 1 γενομένους. B 1 οὐκέτ'. B 2 ἐξόν. D 1 αὐτήν. E 6
 διαπτυστόμενα. E 7 om. ἡ
 859 A 1 om. ἡ. B 7 τὸν περὶ τῶν τε. C 3 om. ὡς εἴρηκα σκοπεῖσθαι
 860 B 4 μεγέθει. C 4 ὑμέτερον. C 8 λέγοντα (om. με)
 861 B 6 ἡμῶν. B 7 δούς. C 1 ὅτι νομοθετήσῃ τίνα τρόπον for κατα-
 νομ. τινὰ τρ. C 3 ἄλλην. C 5 retain καὶ . . . C 7 λέγειν.
 D 4 νόμιμον. D 6 τινὶ
 862 A 8 = nisi quidem vincat which suits ἐὰν ἦγε μὴ νικᾷ. B 6
 βλαβὲν ὑγιᾶς. C 3 εἰς φιλίαν. C 6 om. δέ ut vid.
 863 B 8 πᾶν

- 864 A 2 τοῦτον. A 3 ψυχᾷς. A 4 κἄν. B 5 om. πάνυ μὲν οὖν (so AO). B 8 τούτου δὲ τριάδος (om. αὐτοῦ). C 4 συμφώνων. D 1 τε. D 5 παιδείᾳ. D 6 ἐκλεχθεῖσιν
- 865 A 1 φόνου δὴ πέρι καθάπερ. A 1 retain πειρώμεθα. A 2 om. πέρι φόνου. A 7 retain τῶν ἀρχόντων. B 1 καθαρθεῖς. C 6 χρήσασθαι. D 7 βιαίως ἐν ἐλευθέρῳ. D 7 σώματι for φρονήματι
- 866 D 1 πῶραν (removing comma after it). Arm. renders "primam partem navis"
- 867 A 7 ἐκουσίως. D 6 ἡμερώτερος. D 6 add τὰ
- 868 A 4 ὁ. B 7 ἂν ἐθέλωσι. C 2 ἄλλος. C 5 ἂν ἐθέλωσιν. C 5 ἂν δ' ὁ] ἂ δὲ or ὁ δὲ and add ἐὰν bef. κτείνῃ in C 7. C 8 καθαιρέσθω. E 2 τριετείς ut vid. E 6 om. ἀδελφός. E 7 om. ἡ ἀδελφῇ . . . ἀδελφῇν. E 10 ὧν
- 869 A 6 ἐκούσιον. B 4 τὸ. C 4 ἄλλης ut vid. C 5 ἐν νόμῳ. D 4 ἀμυνόμενος
- 870 A 4 om. ἡ. C 8 φόνους. D 6 λόγον
- 871 A 4 ἱερὰ μήτε ἀγορὰν. B 5 προτρέπεται. B 7 λύτρων for λουτρῶν. D 7 om. τῶν. So W-M.
- 872 A 1 βουλευσῇ or ? βουλευθῇ. C 3 retain μὴ. C 7 ἐφ' οἷσι. C 8 προσφιλές
- 873 A 5 retain ἡ μήτρως
- 874 A 7 om. καὶ. B 4 οὗτος . . . B 7 καθαρὸς εἴη retain
- 874 B 5 om. κύριος. C 1 ἐλὼν. C 1 κτείνῃ τις. E 4 νόμον ut vid. E 5 προτρεπομένων. E 8 τῶν
- 875 D 5 δὲ. E 1 πότε. E 3 μηδένα δυνατόν
- 876 A 4 τίς οὖν κτλ. Arm. agrees with B. B 5 τότε. E 3 τε
- 877 A 6 τούτου for τούτῳ (Richards). B 1 τινα for τὴν (Richards)
- 877 B 4 posterius ἂν. C 7 εἰᾶν post οὐσίαν add. E 5 ἄλλου. E 7 retain ἡ κειμένη ἡ καὶ ἐν
- 878 A 8 om. comma after πατρός. B 8 ἔστω τῶν. C 2 retain ἂν. C 4 τετραπλασίαν. C 5 βλάβη. C 8 πόλει. D 7 τούτῳ τρώσῃ. E 4 οὗτοι for αὐτοὶ
- 879 A 6 τινα for τις. B 3 ἱκανός. C 7 ἔπει. D 6 ἐαυτὸν (om. καὶ)
- 880 A 4 om. τῷ. A 5 ἀνεπονειδίστου. B 3 om. μὴ. D 8 χρηστῶν. E 2 τῇ
- 881 A 1 τιμωριῶν
- 882 A 1 ? ἐν τούτῳ αὐτῷ "eorundem horum," which involves τούτων αὐτῶν and om. ἐν

BOOK X

- 885 A 4 τῶν ἀρχόντων. C 2 ᾧ τῷ. C 5 εἵποιεν. C 7 νομίζομεν.
D 1 ὑμῖν
- 886 A 2 τε καὶ τὰ. A 7 ὑμῶν. A 9 δι' ἀκρασίαν. C 9 ὀρθῶς. E 4 ὅτε
- 887 A 6 τὰ δὲ ut vid. for τὸν δὲ. D 2 νῦν οὖν. D 7 τῶν αὐτῶν
γονέων (rest uncertain). E 7 ὥς. C 5 = precatorius mihi
videtur facere for εὐχὴν μοι δοκεῖ (? sense)
- 888 E 5 . . . E 6, agrees with AO.
- 889 A 7 πλάττειν. C 2 om. οὕτως. C 5 οὐ. D 1 παιδείας. E 4
ἄλλοις. E 5 ἑαυτοῖσι or ἑαυτοῖς. E 6 δὲ
- 890 A 3 om. ἅπαντα. A 3 παρὰ νέοις. B 5 στάντα. D 7 ἦττον.
E 6 μὴν
- 891 B 8 ἀλλὰ δὴ λέγε μοι πάλιν. D 2 εὖ. E 1 ἐτέρῳ. E 2 om.
θεοῖς. E 7 δὲ
- 892 B 1 ταύτης. B 7 φύσις. B 7 ἐπονομάζουσιν αὐτὸ τοῦτο. C 1,
2 and 3 thus: Kl. πῶς; Ath. οὐκ ὀρθῶς φύσιν . . . πρῶτα; εἰ δὲ
κτλ. C 5 εἶναι διαφέρον ὥς ὃ τι φύσει. D 8 χρὴ ut vid.
- 893 B 2 τὴν αὐτῶν ὥς εἰσιν. B 3 παντάπασι ut vid. B 4 ἐπεισβαίνω-
μεν. B 6 κατὰ τάδε is rendered as if re vera, certe, valde.
C 6 κύκλῳ. C 8 ἄγουσα. E 3 ἄλλοις
- 894 A 1 γίγνεται κτλ. Arm. paraphrases: "How indeed comes
to be a becoming of all when it is destroying (or being de-
stroyed)? This suggests the reading διαφθαρῇ. B 8 ἐτέραν
. . . κίνησιν. C 1 αὐτῶν. C 5 ἕτερα ut vid. C 10 τίνα
- 895 B 1 τὴν . . . B 3 μεταπτώσεως Atheniensi continuavit, postea
B 3 ἀρχὴν . . . B 7 δευτέραν Cliniae tribuit Arm. Itemque
Cliniae ἀληθέστατα λέγεις, sed male. B 1 αὐτήν. B 6
μεταβολῶν. C 6 εἶναι. D 5 ὄνομα (om. τὸ)
- 896 A 3 τὸ ἑαυτὸ. A 4 om. ὃ δὴ. B 3 γενομένη. B 3 γε. B 3
ἀρχή. C 2 ἡμῖν. C 9 om. καὶ βουλήσεις. C 7 add τῆς before
ψυχῆς (Richards)
- 897 B 1 γλυκὲ καὶ πικρὸν. B 2 θεῖον. B 2 θεὸς οὕσα ὀρθὰ. D 2
ὀρθῶς. E 8 γε τοσοῦτον τῶν τότε ἔτι τοῦτό γε
- 898 A 2 ταῦτα. A 3 ἐν. D 7 ἡμῖν ἄστρο ἀρμ. D 8 τίνος. E 2
νῶ μόνῳ. E 5 εἰ περιάγει. E 10 αὐτῇ (or ? αὐτῆς)
- 899 A 5 foll. Arm. gives ναὶ alone to Klinias, and begins the
Athenian's speech at τοῦτο μὲν, continuing it to πῶς in A 10.
But it begins a fresh sentence at Αὐτοῦ in A 7. B 3 δὴ.

- B 8 ὅπως. B 9 ὁμολογεῖ. C 8 τούτων. C 9 om. ἡμῶν. E 1 τύχαι] ψυχαι. E 2 εὐδαιμονιζόμεναι ut vid. E 5 add. ἀνοσίους
 900 A 2 ? add. ὅταν ante τὸ νῦν. The text is broken and a word has dropt out. A 2 ἰδών. Arm. has *nshavak* = σημεῖον, which may have crept in from margin where it drew attention to subject matter. A 3 om. παντάπασιν. A 3 αὐτὸς αὐτόπτης. A 3 om. προστυχῆς, but ? thro' mutilation of text. For same reason Arm. is undecisive for or against ὁρᾶς. A 8 ἀγόμενος. A 8 ὑπό τινος. C 3 ἐμπίπτῃ. C 9 ἢ τῶν. D 1 ἤκουον. D 5 συνεξεταζόντων
- 901 A 2 om. τοῦναντίον. A 5 ὁ. A 5 πᾶς. A 8 om. τοι ut vid. B 2 γε νοῦς. B 3 οὖν post τανα ut vid. C 5 ὦν. D 2 ὁ δέ. D 4 om. αἱ. D 5 λέγετε. E 5 ὁμολογοῦμεν
- 902 A 3 δεῖ (om. οὐδέν). A 4 τοῦ for τῷ ut vid. B 9 ὧνπερ. D 2 δέ. D 3 ἐπιμελεῖσθαι. D 4 ἀμελοῦντι. D 4 ἔξει. E 1 τῶν σμικρῶν. E 1 οἱ λιθολόγοι. E 8 τ' ἐπιμελ. καὶ δυν.
- 903 A 1 ἦν. A 7 om. μάλιστα. B 5 ὅλου. B 9 τὸ τέλος W-M. C 3 ὡς ἡ γένεσις. C 3 ἡ. C 7 μὴν . . . D 1 μέρους retain. D 8 κατὰ. D 8 om. αὐτῶν. D 8 om. ἵνα. D 8 προσηκούσης. E 3 ἥπερ. E 3 ῥαστώνης. E 4 om μὴ
- 904 A 2 ἄπειρ'. A 2 διατιθεμένης. A 8 τὸ δν. B 1 ἦ ut vid. B 2 θατέρου. B 2 ὅσον. B 8 τὸ. D 4 δέ δῃ. D 5 μεταλάβῃ. E 2 μεθιδρύσατο
- 905 A 1 καὶ ποιεῖν hic. A 1 om. εἰ. A 2 ἐπεύξεται or ἐπεύζεται. A 3 δικῶν. A 7 αὐτῶν. B 1 ἀπώτερον for ἀγριώτερον. B 5 om. κῆτα. B 5 ? αὐ αὐτῶν. C 1 πόσου δεῖν. C 3 οὐδὲ λόγον. C 6 θεός. D 4 αὐτοὺς for αὐ θεοὺς. D 5 δ'. E 3 om. ἐντελεχῶς
- 906 A 2 φόβον. A 5 ἐστὶν ἡ. A 7 κτῆμα. B 3 δέ. B 4 λῆμα. C 2 σφίσιν. C 5 ἐναντῶν. C 6 αὐτὸ ut vid. C 6 ῥῆμα. D 1 after ἀδίκους adds scholion: sed innocentum ordines diiudicantur. D 3 καὶ κυσὶν. D 9 order φύλακας εἶναι
- 907 A 7 om. μέσων. B 1 ὁ λόγος. B 2 om. πᾶς. B 10 σφοδρότερον. C 4 ret. καὶ οἶα. D 2 εἰ δέ μή. D 4 ὁ λόγος ut vid. E 7 ἐν
- 908 C 2 ret. δ'. C 5 ἐν ὑπάρχοι. D 2 εὐφυνῆς. E 1 om. τὰ ut vid.
- 909 B 2 πολλοὺς. B 6 ἐξαιρεῖν. C 2 προσιέναι δὲ αὐτοῖς. C 6 λαγχάνειν ut vid. C 7 om. ὡς bef. ὄντων. D 3 πᾶσι νόμον. D 8 ἱη. E 1 ἀγνεῖαι. E 1 ἐπιμελεῖς or ? ἐπιμελές. E 2 δν. E 8 καθιεροῦν τε. E 8 ἱερὸν for παρὸν

- 910 B 1 πράξειςιν (om. ταῖς). C 4 ? om. καὶ. E 2 παιδίον. E 2 οἱ. E 5 after εἰσαγαγόντες add. ὡς δεῖ

BOOK XI.

- 913 A 1 δὲ ut vid. A 1 after ἂν add. καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν and after ἀλλήλους add. ὑποθηκῶν. A 2 τὰ δεόμενα ut vid. A 2 δέ. B 2 τοῖς. B 3 om. γῆ. B 5 after ἀνελών add. *alienum* or ἄλλων. B 6 ἐπιδιδοίην ("quantam molem virtus animae et iustitia animae augeret apud me"). C 6 ἀπλούστατον (om. καὶ). D 6 εἰν δὲ τῆς ἄλλης . . . ἀγρονόμοις retain.
- 914 A 3 χρημάτων. D 1 ποτέρου ("of one of the disputants"). D 1 οὗτος. E 1 δικάζειν
- 915 A 4 aft. ἱκανῶς add. ἐπιμελῆται αὐτῶν or similar. B 5 τῷ. C 5 δίκαι ut vid. C 8 ὁτουοῦν ut vid. D 6 ἀλλάττηται
- 916 A 5 λίθων. A 8 om. τούτῳ ut vid. B 2 εἰν δέ τις ἰδιώτης . . . ἀποδοθῇ male C 5 ret. τότε. C 6 αἰσθηται. E 1 ret. τὸ. E 3 om. τε
- 917 A 8 ὁ νῦν ut vid. A 9 om. παρὼν. C 6 κολάζων μὲν. C 6 om. τις
- 918 A 4 ἐλλιπεῖν ut vid. A 6 om. κατὰ πόδα. C 4 δοκῶν. C 5 ret. εἰ. C 5 ἀξιωσώμεθα. D 2 ἐξῆ. E 1 om. δὲ ut vid.
- 919 A 5 ἐταίρους. A 7 μακροτάτων. B 2 αἰσχροῦς. B 5 ὡς πρὸς. C 1 προστετραμμένην. C 2 ἀρωγῇ. D 4 κατοικιεῖ
- 920 A 6 φύλακας εἶναι. A 8 πεπαίδευνται. B 1 ret. ματὰ τε ἐπιτηδεύ. B 2 ἃ προτροπὴν. B 2 προτρέπειν. B 5 om. ἂν. C 5 τὰ δὲ ἀγρονόμους ret. D 3 ὑπὸ ἀδίκου. D 4 ἀπὸ. E 3 om. τὸ
- 921 D 5 τε. D 6 ὡς
- 922 A 1 ὅσοι. A 7 ὀρφανικῶν ut vid. D 4 εἰ τὰ ἐμὰ. E 6 τὸν
- 923 A 2 πῶς; (Cliniae tribuens). B 2 ὑπολαβὼν ("furtum faciens"). D 1 κλήρῳ. E 6 κληρονόμον
- 924 B 2 ret. τὰ. B 4 om. τῆς ut vid. B 7 οἱ. C 2 πάντων. D 6 διασκέψαιτο ἐξ. E 3 τοῦ δὲ. E 6 ret. δὲ. E 8 κατὰ
- 925 A 2 τοῦ τῶν. A 3 γάμων. A 6 πάππων. B 2 πολλὰ or ?πολλάκις. C 6 ἴτῳσαν. D 8 μυρία ἀνθρώποις (om. ἐν). E 4 γαμεῖν . . . E 5 τούτων ret. E 6 δόξειεν. E 7 ret. νομοθέτου καὶ ὑπὲρ
- 926 A 3 προστάττει. B 3 πράττοντος for προστάττοντος. D 8 om. τις. E 2 παιδεύσεις. E 5 ret. φαμεν. E 7 ἐν μελέτῃ
- 927 C 2 αὐ τοῖς ut vid. D 4 τε τοῖς περὶ. D 5 δὴ for μὴ
- 928 B 1 τοῦτον νόμον. E 4 ἐπεὶ

- 929 B 6 ὁ. B 7 διαψηφιζομένων ut vid. (qui clamant). B 7 τοῦ
 υἱοῦ φεύγοντος. C 1 om. τε. D 6 posterius τῶν ret. E 10
 δυστυχία ut vid.
- 930 A 4 ξυνοίσουσιν. A 6 κεχρημένους. B 6 ὄντων. D 1 γενόμενον.
 D 3 ἔσεσθαι. D 6 γεννόμενον and om. τοῦ δούλου. D 7 τοῦτ'
 ἦ. D 8 om. τὸ ut vid. E 4 φρονῆσαι. E 7 παρὰ πᾶσιν
- 931 A 4 χάριν. A 8 ret. ὀρθῶς. C 4 εὐχῶν for ἐν εὐχαῖς. D 2
 νομίσειεν
- 932 A 3 ἀπιόντες νέοι. A 3 σφόδρα] etiam nunc. A 6 κωφῇ] "But
 if anyone is taken hold of by a voiceless rumour and become
 hearingless of such preludes." Did he read κωφῇ or κωφὸν?
 A 6 ὁδε. B 2 ἀποπληρῶν. B 5 ἐπιμελουμένων. C 5 ἕκαστον.
 C 8 ὅσον ut vid. D 4 ἦ
- 933 A 1 εἵπομεν. A 2 ἦ. A 5 ταῦτ' οὖν. B 3 εἴτ' ἐπὶ. C 1 ret.
 παῖδας. E 3 ὧν τῆς. E 6 ὅσα τις ἂν ἕτερος ἄλλον. E 7 μείζω.
 E 8 ζημιούσθω
- 934 A 4 ἦ δι'. A 4 δειλίας. D 4 τὰ τέτταρα. E 1 εὐνόμων. E 5
 ἄλλω
- 935 B 3 om. ὅς οὐ. B 8 ἕκαστον. B 8 ἀνατί. C 6 ἐτέρω. C 7
 λέγωμεν. C 7 ὡς ὁ. D 4 παραδεχόμεθα. D 7 συντεταγμένω.
 E 2 om. δ'
- 936 A 2 ὁ ἀγὼν. A 3 περὶ τοῦ. A 6 om. τῷ. B 3 πεινῶν. B 5
 κεκτῆται. E 7 κληθεῖς ut vid.
- 937 B 2 ἐπισκηφθῇ. B 3 ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. B 5 ? ἐπισκέψεις. C 6 δίκη.
 D 2 δ'. D 3 διαδικασίαν. D 4 ὁποτέρως δ' ἂν κριθῇ. E 2 om.
 οὐ. E 3 διαβολή τις κακῇ. E 4 τέχνη. E 5 αὐτὴν τό τε. E 6
 post ἄλλω distinguit

BOOK XII.

- 941 A 1 παραπρεσβεύῃ τι. So Badham. A 3 αὐτὰς for οὔσας. B 5
 πλημμελῶν καὶ ut vid. B 8 om. ὅς. C 4 μαχέσθω. C 6 τι.
 D 3 ἀλλὰ. D 5 ἔλῃ ὡς ἰασίμω. D 6 ὄντι
- 942 A 8 ἐθίζεσθαι Badh. B 1 τι. B 4 ἐστάναι. B 4 om. θ'. C 7
 τοῦτο (om. καὶ)
- 943 A 2 om. δοκεῖν. So Ficino. A 2 περὶ. B 4 μᾶλλον. B 5
 περιγενέσθαι. B 8 ἐκάστων τούτων. C 2 ἔθουσιν. D 3 aft. αὐτοῖς
 add. ἱεροῖς. D 3 οἷς περὶ. E 1 αἰδοῦς. E 3 add. δεῖ
- 944 A 3 ἔμπνους. B 1 τόποις. C 3 διαφέρει. C 6 μετέχειν for

- μετὰ κάκης male, ? corruption of μετὰ τάχους. C 7 μεταβολῆς.
D 2 μῆ. D 6 ὥς. D 8 om. 'κείνη. E 4 ὦν κακὸς
- 945 B 6 εἶπη. B 6 om. ἦ. B 7 τὴν ἀρχὴν. C 1 ἀρχόντων. C 4
ζῶν. C 4 ἐντόνους. D 3 ἦ ἦ. D 7 τὸ αὐτὸ. D 7 ἔτι νεύουσai.
E 3 αὐτῶν
- 946 B 2 λειφθῶσιν. C 6 κατὰ ante δώδεκα. D 2 ἕκαστος. D 3 om.
καὶ. E 2 τετιμένον ut vid. 947 A 3 ἐτέρων. A 5 εἶναι. B 1
ret. τῶν. C 3 ἑκατὸν. C 7 ἄλλους. C 8 ἐφυμνεῖν. D 6 προ-
τίμων. E 4 ἀνεπίδεῃ. E 6 ταῦτα
- 948 A 5 τὸν alterum ret. A 8 διώκων. B 1 δ' ὁ. C 2 om. δῆ.
C 2 φασμέν. C 3 τὸ. C 4 δὲ om. δῆ. C 6 om. κατὰ. C 7
? πολλὰς
- 949 A 1 δεῖ for αἰ. A 6 δι' ἀδίκων. C 2 οὐδ' ἐννεοττεύοντες. C 8 ἡ
πομπεύσεων. D 3 ἱατὴν. E 3 μὴ for μήτε
- 950 A 4 om. αὐτοῖς. B 7 ὅσοι. B 7 χρηστοί. B 8 ἐστι. D 4
εὐνόμοις
- 951 A 5 ἄν τινες. A 7 om. δὲ post ἀπειργέτω. A 7 νόμος. B 3 αὐ-
τοὺς. B 3 γνώμη. B 4 ἔθειςιν ἢ θέσει (? a conflation). B 5
παντὸς δ'. D 3 ὁπόσ'. D 5 οὗτος
- 952 A 2 τι om. A 4 συμφέρειν. A 4 ἃ μαθοῦσι. A 5 τὰ. B 2
ἀποβλέποντας. B 8 εὐρεῖν. B 9 ἦκοι κοινούτω ("citissime
communicet"). D 1 γ' ἐν ut vid.
- 953 A 6 παρεσκευασμένας. A 7 ὅπως. C 7? om. ἐν. C 7 om. ἦ.
C 7 δόξαι. D 1 ὁ τοιοῦτος. D 4 ἱκανὸς (Richards). D 5 ξενῶν
τὴν τῶν. E 7 ἡ τριῶν
- 954 A 6 ἐλπίζειν. C 3 χρόνου (om. δὲ). C 6 ἦ, ἐὰν. D 2 μηδὲν
παρελθόντος or ἀπελθόντος (ἐνιαυτοῦ is bungled into ἐνὶ αὐτοῦ).
D 5 τοῦ λοιποῦ χρόνου
- 955 B 5 ἐάν τις. B 5 κλεμμάδιον ὀτιοῦν. C 7 δ'. E 2 ἐὰν τοῦ.
E 6 τῇ. E 6 ἐστία
- 956 A 1 ἀπολελοιπότος. A 2 εὐχερὲς. E 2 χρόνων. E 6 παρακατα-
βάσεων
- 957 B 4 τότε. B 6 ret. πολλῶν. B 7 καὶ καλῶν. C 4 κυριώτατα
τοῦ. C 5 ἃ εἶπερ. E 4 ἐπικεκλωσμένοι] Arm. renders "com-
motis" as if agreeing with οἷσιν
- 958 A 2 ἄξιοι. A 2 γίγνονται. B 2 δικασίμων ut vid. D 2 μοίρα.
D 3 δέ. D 4 ἦ. D 6 φράζοντας ut vid. E 1 ἃ δὲ] "sed ubi."
E 8 τῶν] ἱκανὰ ἂν εἶη or ἱκανὰ ἦ, probably a paraphrase

- 959 A 1 μὴ μακρότερον. B 5 om. γὰρ. C 1 ἂν κακῶν. C 7 ἐμπιπλάντα. E 7 νόμῳ νομοθετοῦντι.
- 960 B 1 πᾶσι. B 8 δεῖ. C 4 εἴρηται. C 5 om. τὰ. C 8 τὴν δ' W.-M. C 8 δὲ. C 8 σωτηρίαν for σώτειραν. C 8 λεχθέντων. C 9 ἀπηκασμένην ut vid. and om. τῇ. C 9 τῷ πυρὶ. D 1 ἀπεργαζομένην ut vid. D 7 om. μὴ. D 8 κτήματι
- 961 A 6 ἐν καιρῷ. A 6-7 = iisdem placentis which confirms participle δόξαν of W.-M. B 1 τριακονταετῇ. B 8 om. παντί. B 8 ret. ἦν. E 1 ἀλλ' ὁ περὶ τί
- 962 A 3 σώματι. A 7 ὅπως ἂν νοῦν. A 7 om. τι. B 2 μηδ' εἰδείη. B 9 πρῶτον. C 1 τοῦ τοιούτου ut vid. E 8 οὐ for οὐδὲν
- 963 A 9 δεῖ. A 11 δὴ or ? δὲ. B 6 ἂν, πάντων. C 8 ret. καὶ. C 8 ἅπαντα. D 1 ὄντων. D 6 ἐν. D 9 ὁ. E 3 ἐρῶ
- 964 A 8 γε ὄντα. B 6 φρόνησις δικαιοσύνη. C 2 οὐ δεῖ διδάσκοντα. C 5 πάσῃ ἀρετῇ. E 1 κύτους "totum fulcimentum capitis." E 2 ἀπειλεγμένους] ? ἀφιγμένους
- 965 A 4 ret. ὅλην. A 6 διηκριβωμένους. B 7 ret. τὸν. C 10 τί ποτε. D 2 ἐν δν. D 6 ret. ὥς. E 1 οὐτ' εἰ πολλὰ. E 2 οὐθ' ὥς] ὥς. E 3 οὐκοῦν. E 3 ἡμῖν. E 3 ἀμωσγέπως ("sicut hoc modo"). E 5 παράπαν ἂν δοκῇ εἶναι δὴ χρεών. The last three words certainly stood in the translator's Greek. E 6 ἡκιστα νῆ. E 6 ξένιον
- 966 A 6 μόνον ἕκαστον. B 4 ὁ αὐτός. C 8 μὴν or ? simply om. μὴ. D 2 ἐγκρίτων ut vid.
- 967 A 4 ἀνάγκαις. C 2 om. δὴ. C 2 πρὸ τῶν. D 1 ἀλλὰ τε αὖ. D 8 τὸ εἰρημένον (om. νῦν). D 8 om. τὸν τε εἰρημένον. So Badham. E 1 om. νοῦν (did νοῦν and νῦν get confused in the margin?). E 2 λάβη
- 968 A 1 ὅσα τε μή. B 3 ἀλλ' ὥ λῶστε. C 1 λέγωμεν. C 5 νομοθετητέον. C 9 καταλεκτέος. C 9 εἴη. D 5 πρὸς οὓς or καθ' οὓς for οὓς. D 5 ἕκαστα. E 2 τοῦ. E 3 Arm. om. ἀπόρρητα . . . ἀπόρρητα, and so does not serve to decide between λεχθέντα and ἐλεγχθέντα
- 969 A 1 ταῦτα. B 1 τοῖς . . . ἐπιγιγνομένοις ut vid. So W.-M. B 2 τοιούτος. B 7 νοῦ τε. B 8 ξυμμιχθῶσι

 MINOS.

Plato's Minos is edited by Burnet from two manuscripts.
A — Cod. Parisinus Graecus 1807.

F = Cod. Vindobonensis 55, suppl. phil. gr. 39.

In comparing the Armenian I have confined myself to Burnet's Apparatus Criticus, signifying only those Greek or conjectural variants which it confirms, as I have in the last five books of the *Laws*.

- St. II, p. 313 A 2 τῶν νόμων. A 5 ἂν εἰ ἡρόμην. A 6 om. με. A 6 ἀνέρου. A 7 ἐρέσθαι. B 5 εἰπέ. C 1 καὶ ἄλλο . . . ὁρώμενα om. with A. C 2 ἄλλο δὲ. C 3 ἄλλο δὲ. C 4 ἄλλο μοι
- 314 A 2 ταύτῃ . . . A 5 αἰσθήσει om. Arm. B 4 μαντικῇ ἢ. D 8 αὐτὸ. E 1 χρηστὰ. E 7 αὐτῷ
- 315 A 8 οἱ. A 8 χρώμενοι. B 7 δὲ for τε. C 1 καὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν. C 2 καὶ σὺ. C 6 ἐχρώμεθα. C 8 οἱ δ'. D 1 ἔτι. E 9 Ἐγὼ μὲν. . . 316 A 2 ναί om. Arm.
- 316 A 2 οὐκοῦν καὶ ἐν Πέρσαις ret. A 3 om. καὶ ἐν Πέρσαις and subst. ναί. A 4 πλεῖον. A 6 βαρύτερα νομίζεται ἐνθάδε. B 6 καὶ φαίνεται ταῦτα. D 2 ἄλλοι ἄλλα. D 4 αὐτοῖς. D 4 εἰδῶσι. E 4 om. γεωργικοὶ. E 6 νόμοι. E 6 om. ἡμῖν. E 10 om. οὗτοι
- 317 A 8 om. οἱ. A 8 ret. νόμους. A 8 ἀνδρῶν. B 3 συγγράψουσι. B 3 οὐ . . . B 4 τῶν αὐτῶν ret. with A. B 8 om. ἂν. C 6 ὁ. C 7 εἶναι (om. βασιλικός). D 3 διαθώμεθα. D 4 ἐπὶ γῇ. D 7 καὶ αἱ. D 8 om. καὶ with Hermann
- 318 A 2 σώματος. B 2 γέγονε τοῖς (om. ἐν). B 2 om. νόμοις with Hermann. C 1 ταῦτα for μόνα λοιπά. C 6 λέγεις. E 1 τί δὲ οὐ ταῦτα. E 7 οὐδ' ὅτι
- 319 A 7 τούτων. A 7 ret. ὁ. A 9 μίνω ὥς. B 3 εἰσὶν αὐτῇ ut vid. C 4 παγκάλη. D 3 ῥαδάμανθυν alterum ret. D 3 δικάζ. πεπ. D 9 ὁ ἀριστῆς. E 4 προτέρᾳ
- 320 A 3 οἷς ut vid. for οὐ. C 5 τάλω. C 5 τάλως. D 3 γένετο. D 3 βασιλῆων. E 2 εὐλαβήσῃ. E 6 prius ἢ ret. E 6 κατηγοροῦντες
- 321 A 2 οἷονται. A 7 δασμοὺς. B 7 κρήτες. B 7 μίνως. B 7 ῥαδαμάνθυνος. C 5 order ἀγ. νομοθ. D 2 ἂ ret. D 4 αὐτῶν. D 4 ὑπὲρ τῆς. D 8 ἐν αὐταῖς. D 9 ἀγαθὸν καὶ. D 9 φλαῦρον ut vid.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

21, TRINITY GARDENS,
FOLKESTONE, ENGLAND.

II.—NOTES ON CERTAIN ATHENIAN GENERALS OF THE YEAR 424-3 B. C.

The lists of Athenian generals for the first half of the Peloponnesian War, to which we must go for a large part of our knowledge of the political vicissitudes in Athens during this period, are in need of correction. In certain cases, apparently slight modifications make possible the re-assembling of our material in such a way as to throw considerable light on the tribal affiliations and political views of certain generals.¹ In this paper I shall use as a basis for discussion the revised lists of Beloch, indicating, wherever necessary, the changes that must be made.² In addition to revising the list of generals for the year 424-3, a list that offers us several points of unusual interest, and one that can be reconstructed with greater precision than most, I shall try to make clear the political situation of that year by showing how the change in public opinion that swept over Athens after the defeat at Delion and the victories of Brasidas in the north found expression in four or five important bye elections and resulted in the return of Nicias' supporters to office.

DEMODOCUS.

No one, I think, after reading Thucydides' account of the campaigns of 424,³ would have assigned Demodocus to the year

¹ As this paper was written preliminary to my article, *Pericles' Political Heirs*, Class. Phil., April, 1924, pp. 124 ff., the two papers supplement each other; and statements made there depend for proof upon the material collected here. For the political views and party platforms of the rival leaders, Cleon and Nicias, see that paper, where I have shown that Nicias was neither an oligarch nor a pacifist, but a Periclean democrat, conservative only when contrasted with Cleon. In the present paper I shall use the word "conservative" in that sense.

² Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*,³ II, 2, pp. 260-269. I have chosen Beloch in preference to Arthur Krause, *Attische Strategenlisten bis 146*, Weimar, 1914, because his lists are more readily accessible, more recent, and on the whole more accurate, even though not quite so detailed. In a few cases Krause is probably to be preferred, but in the main, so far as concerns this paper, the errors of the one are the errors of the other.

³ Thuc., iv. 66-75.

425-4, if Beloch had not come to the conclusion that the chronology of Thucydides was inexact or that Demodocus and his colleagues Aristides and Lamachus held commands after their year of office had expired.⁴ The operations of these generals in the Hellespont and the Black Sea followed, or were contemporary with, the expedition into the Megarid, led by Hippocrates and Demosthenes. As neither Hippocrates nor Demosthenes held office in 425-4, their campaign came shortly after they entered the strategion, midsummer 424, and by the same token Demodocus should be considered a general of their year.

Beloch for two reasons, neither of which is adequate, sets aside the evidence of Thucydides as of no importance, whereupon other writers, accepting his assumption as a fact, are led into unwarrantable deductions.⁵ Beloch's first assumption is that no general would hold the lucrative and responsible post of revenue-collector for two years in succession, and since Aristides served in that capacity during the preceding winter,⁶ he and both his colleagues, Lamachus and Demodocus, could not have commanded the tribute-collecting ships in 424-3. It hardly seems worth while to answer such an argument. In the first place, although we may agree with Beloch that no Athenian general, not even an Aristides, could be trusted with the collection of unpaid tribute for more than a year at a time, we need not suppose that generals in this position invariably failed of re-election or were recalled to Athens immediately upon the expiration of a year in office. Furthermore, it was a very simple matter to replace generals serving in the Aegean when it was time for their successors to take over their commands. The Salaminia and Paralos were constantly cruising about on errands of this kind; but probably for a voyage to the Hellespont it would be unnecessary to make use of these vessels. There were enough merchant ships sailing on that route to provide accommodations for an occasional general. A few days would suffice to bring every general to his new station, and as several months intervened between the elections and the time when the generals took up their duties, it seems unreasonable to suppose

⁴ *Attische Politik seit Pericles*, pp. 303 f.

⁵ Cf. Busolt's account of the elections of 425-4, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1084.

⁶ *Thuc.*, iv. 50.

that in ordinary circumstances, at least in the Aegean, there would be any delay in relieving generals whose terms had expired.

Beloch's further assumption that Athens never had more than ten generals in a given year seems at first sight a more reasonable argument for assigning Demodocus and his colleagues to the previous year, for otherwise, Beloch points out, we should be confronted with an impossible number of eleven generals. But as a matter of fact, it is probable that Athens had twelve generals or more in 424-3 rather than ten, for Hippocrates lost his life at Delion and Thucydides lost his office at Amphipolis. To fill these positions special elections were undoubtedly held, and one of the eleven generals of course owed his position to one of these bye elections.

This solution of the difficulty has two advantages over Beloch's. It preserves Thucydides' reputation for accuracy,—Beloch, I believe, does not consider him worthy of a pedestal⁷—and it also enables us to understand why there were so many conservative generals in a year when the regular spring elections brought victory to the radical city democracy led by Cleon and his aristocratic cat's-paw Hippocrates. The latter apparently acted as commander-in-chief. After the unlucky campaign in Boeotia and the loss of Amphipolis a conservative reaction set in that resulted in the armistice of the following spring. Can we doubt that the special election held after the death of Hippocrates brought into office a man from the opposing party?

The question remains, what were the political affiliations of Demodocus? It is difficult to say with any certainty, but judged by the task to which he was assigned, and perhaps by the company with which he was associated, he was probably one of Cleon's henchmen. Aside from the opportunities for graft in the revenue-collector's post, which made it a plum for demagogues and their associates⁸ to wheedle out of the gullible demos, conditions made it imperative that reliable and ruthless democrats should be on guard in the Aegean to forestall revolts caused by the heavily increased tribute and to enforce payment

⁷ For one of Beloch's gibes against the author, see *Gr. Gesch.*, II, 1, p. 333, note 2.

⁸ Aristophanes, *Knights*, 1067 ff.; *Wasps*, 668-679.

from unwilling and delinquent subjects. Unscrupulous democrats were also needed to bring unfounded charges against the wealthy citizens of the allied states, by which they might be brought to trial and their property confiscated for the benefit of the hungry populace or the unpaid sailors.⁹ It is hard to imagine Cleon at the time of his greatest popularity allowing any one but his most loyal supporters to undertake such a task.¹⁰ Aristophanes by his reference to the greedy fox-dogs of tribute-collecting ships in the *Knights*, 424, and by his more detailed accusations given in the *Wasps* two years later, shows clearly that about this very time Cleon had secured the appointment of his friends to this profitable position. Though these strictures may be grossly exaggerated, they serve to cast suspicion upon every man who acted as revenue-collector at the time of Cleon's ascendancy, and, more important for our purpose, to brand him as a radical democrat. He may have been as honest as the day, or again he may have been one of those aristocrats who were attacked by the Old Oligarch¹¹ because they espoused the democratic cause for the benefit of their personal finances. It is impossible to say, nor does it greatly matter. At least it is hard to agree with Busolt that Demodocus probably belonged to the party of Nicias.¹² Busolt might have come to a different conclusion if he had seen that Demodocus was elected as a colleague of Cleon in 424, and not, as he thought, as a colleague of Nicias in 425 when the conservative democrats were comparatively successful at the polls. Demodocus may have held office the previous year as well, but there is absolutely no evidence that he did.

ARISTIDES.

Aristides, the colleague of Demodocus in the summer of 424, should be added to the list of generals for 424-3,¹³ but since Thucydides mentions him as a revenue-collector in the preceding winter,¹⁴ his name should not be taken from Beloch's list for 425-4.

⁹ Ar., *Knights*, 1067 ff.; *Wasps*, 286 ff.; *Peace*, 639 ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Ps.-Xenophon, *Constitution of Athens*, i. 14.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, ii. 20.

¹³ Thuc., iv. 75.

¹² *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1084.

¹⁴ Thuc., iv. 50.

His politics were probably the same as Cleon's, for what we have said of Demodocus applies with equal or greater force to Aristides. It has been suggested that Panourgipparchides, whom Aristophanes criticizes for having a highly paid sinecure on the Thracian coast, is Aristides the son of Archippos who was serving there in a lucrative post a few months later.¹⁵ That is quite possible, and, if true, it would make of Aristides a radical.¹⁶

Now that we know that Aristides held office for two years, it is possible to assign him to a tribe with a considerable degree of certainty. Beloch's lists of generals, with the additions and corrections indicated by this paper,¹⁷ show that in one or the other of these two years every tribe except Cecropis is represented by a general.¹⁸ Aristides, therefore, can have belonged to no other tribe. He was Laches' successor.¹⁹

LAMACHUS.

Lamachus, like Demodocus, served in 424-3²⁰ but not in 425-4; but unlike Demodocus and Aristides he was something more than a politician, or perhaps it would be more accurate to call him less of a party man.²¹ He was the forerunner of the

¹⁵ Velsen, *Philol. Anz.*, VII, 1876, 386; cf. Herbst, *Philol.*, XLIX, 161; Busolt, *op. cit.*, 621; Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 603.

¹⁶ I can not agree with Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1084, when he makes Aristides a partisan of Nicias.

¹⁷ For proof that Pythodorus does not belong to Cecropis see page 155 *infra*. Since he is not a member of Cecropis, he should be assigned to Hippothontis.

¹⁸ During the Peloponnesian War I feel sure that the generals were elected each one by his own tribe. Therefore all tribes would be represented except when the tribe of the commander-in-chief had two generals.

¹⁹ It is tempting to consider Aristides as the father or close relative of Aristomachus, an oligarch who was active in the Revolution of 411, Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 32, 1, for an Aristides, son of Aristomachus, of the tribe Cecropis, is known to us in the next century. Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.*, 1689. We need not be surprised to find the son of a democrat taking part in the oligarchic revolution, for some of the most radical democratic politicians became oligarchs when the tide turned that way. See Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1350.

²⁰ Thuc., iv. 75.

²¹ Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.*, 1084.

professional soldiers of the fourth century, a man who apparently had no large source of income aside from the perquisites of office, who padded his expense accounts so as to get a pair of shoes or an overcoat, and whose reputation for strategic ability in the army, although high, was insufficient to counteract the disdain felt by the well-to-do hoplite farmers for their impecunious leader.²² He had all the qualifications for generalship, except wealth and social position, and although he had enviable renown for bravery and military ability, he was never forgiven for not having been born a gentleman, at least not until after his heroic death in Sicily.

As a semi-professional soldier Lamachus was a convenient person to have in the strategion. On him could be foisted the disagreeable duties that promised much danger and little glory. It was Lamachus who was sent into the Black Sea when his colleagues chose the easy and more showy task of reducing Antandrus, and it was Lamachus who is pictured by Aristophanes in the *Acharnians* as being sent on a dangerous expedition by the numerous and incompetent generals.²³ He appears there as a well-disciplined subordinate ready to answer his country's call at a moment's notice, and it was precisely for this rôle that he was chosen to go with Nicias and Alcibiades on the ill-fated Sicilian expedition.

A man of that type is not likely to be much of a politician, and whenever he does enter politics as a candidate for office, he does it as a soldier relying upon the fame of his military exploits. For some reasons this should have been a simpler task in fifth-century Athens than it is today, for there party lines were not strictly drawn and party government was unknown. There, too, the chief elective office called for strategic ability, or at least military experience accompanied by the habit of command. Thus in theory it should have been easy for men who had distinguished themselves in the field to enter the strategion; but in fact it was quite the contrary, for the custom of choosing generals from the *καλοὶ καγαθοί* was very firmly entrenched. A new man like Lamachus would find it difficult to ride into office on a flood of hero worship, and once in office he would meet

²² Plutarch, *Nicias*, 15; *Alcibiades*, 18, 21.

²³ *Acharnians*, 1071 ff.

with a certain amount of insubordination among the troops, as both Lamachus and Cleon discovered, the one in Sicily, the other before Amphipolis. Only as subordinates could self-made generals perform the most effective service. They were most useful when they were under the protecting wing of some friend or patron.

Their tenure of office was in like measure dependent upon finding some one to vouch for them and to throw the weight of his influence in their favor. The career of Lamachus illustrates what I mean. He first appears as a general in the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes, but elected, as it would seem, under peculiar circumstances. The scenes in which he appears have been a source for much discussion, because, while he enters as a general in one passage,²⁴ in another he is apparently not one of them but merely their tool,²⁵ in other words, a subordinate officer whom they can order about. One explanation for this change of rôles is that he had been elected in a bye election to take the place of Procles who had fallen in Demosthenes' Aetolian expedition.²⁶ And this may well be true, for Dicaeopolis is careful to tell us that at the election only a handful of cuckoos voted.²⁷ At a special election during the busy season in summer the peasant vote would probably be very small. The three cuckoos represent the worthless citizens of the city demes, *voces et praeterea nihil*.²⁸

Of course Dicaeopolis, the typical Attic peasant, would bear it ill that a man of Lamachus' stamp should get into office by such a fluke, although he might hold Lamachus in high esteem for his bravery and devotion to duty, virtues which he could appreciate much better than his fellow-tribesmen from the city. That Lamachus had shown himself possessed of these qualities in Aetolia, where Procles lost his life, is Müller-Strübing's happy suggestion.²⁹ The name of Lamachus, hero of the

²⁴ *Acharnians*, 566-625.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1071-1226.

²⁶ Gilbert, *Beitr. z. inn. Gesch. Athens*, 175. Beloch, *Att. Pol.*, 302. is wrong, I think, in his conclusion that Lamachus was not a general in 426-5.

²⁷ *Acharnians*, 598.

²⁸ Rogers, note on *Acharnians*, 598.

²⁹ Müller-Strübing, *Acharnians*, 575.

"crests and cohorts,"³⁰ was probably in every one's mouth at the time of the special election. Perhaps the pun of Aristophanes, so reminiscent of the peculiar characteristics of the Aetolian terrain,³¹ was coined soon after the news of Lamachus' heroism reached Athens and as a slogan carried his cause to victory. A minority election and military fame had combined to bring about the election of a *novus homo*.

It would be interesting to know just what Aristophanes thought of Lamachus, and whether the Lamachus of his plays is the real man or merely a punning personification of the war spirit to which was attached the martial name of a well-known soldier.³² If we can determine the underlying purpose of the scenes in which Lamachus appears, it may help us to answer these questions. At first we see him as an ally of the warlike Acharnian semi-chorus, but at the end he is represented as a symbol of the inefficiency of the generals in office. After fighting for his country at their command, he returned wounded in the midst of the festivities being celebrated by Dicaeopolis.³³ In his eagerness to get at the enemy, he had suffered humiliating and ludicrous accidents, running into a stake, falling into a ditch, spraining his ankle and bumping his head; then recovering quickly he had brought to a stop the rout of his disorganized command and driven the Boeotians away in flight. There is nothing of the cowardly *Miles Gloriosus* in this,—Busolt is wrong in calling him a *Bramarbas*,³⁴ nor can we detect any personal malice against him in the mind of the author of

³⁰ Rogers, translation of τῶν λόφων καὶ τῶν λόχων, *Acharnians*, 575.

³¹ Müller-Strübing, *loc. cit.*

³² Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*, 54 f., thinks that Aristophanes did not try to individualize Lamachus. To Croiset the Lamachus of the play is nothing but a caricature of the class of professional soldiers to which he belonged, a class that was much hated by the peasants. It was this class that Aristophanes was attacking, not Lamachus the representative of the war party and the tool and associate of the demagogues. There is much to be said for the view that Aristophanes was holding up to ridicule the professional officer with his exaggerated military air and his blustering ways, but it seems to me that he had a great deal more in mind when he wrote the scenes where Lamachus appears.

³³ *Acharnians*, 1174 ff.

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, 1084.

the play. On the contrary, Lamachus is the unfortunate victim of war in this scene where the evils of war are so humorously contrasted with the blessings of peace. It is Lamachus in whose mouth is placed the most biting criticism of the generals; and it is he who suffers most, through their fault, in being prevented from attending the Dionysiac revels. It is not difficult to sympathize with him, and one can imagine that Aristophanes was actually sorry for him, as he was sorry for all those who had suffered in the war.

The persons against whom Aristophanes was really directing his shafts were the incompetent leaders of the war party, not a more or less competent subordinate. Aristophanes undoubtedly did take occasion to ridicule Lamachus' poverty, his eagerness to serve in well paid positions, and perhaps his unpaid debts, but Lamachus was hardly one of the young men of "noble birth and little worth,"³⁵ such as Dicaeopolis complains of, no Braggart or Impostor from Diomeia, perhaps the successor to Nicias, no Geretothedorus, who was perhaps Procles the son of Theodorus, a general who had been recently killed in battle and replaced by Lamachus himself.³⁶ The contrast is evident. Not Lamachus, but his colleagues are being attacked.³⁷

On the whole, it is difficult to find any more malice in the characterization of Lamachus in the *Acharnians* than in that of Nicias and Demosthenes in the *Knights* of the following year; and likewise, the historical Lamachus of Thucydides and Plutarch is easily discernible in the broad humor of the play. I think we may go even deeper into the mind of Aristophanes and say that he felt an admiration for certain of Lamachus' traits of character, his bravery, loyalty, and devotion to duty. After his death in Sicily, Aristophanes speaks of him only with respect.³⁸

³⁵ Rogers, note on *Acharnians*, 603.

³⁶ *Acharnians*, 598-625.

³⁷ Croiset, *op. cit.*, 54 f., I think, has overrated the part played by the professional officers in the politics and campaigns of this period. See also *op. cit.*, 57. This has resulted in his stressing the martial peculiarities of the rough soldier which he admits are merely the external trappings of the type to which Lamachus belonged. Thus his attention is diverted by details of little significance from the real purpose of the author.

³⁸ *Frogs*, 1039; *Thesmophor.*, 841.

In the *Eirene*, presented after the Peace of Nicias was assured, there are passing references to Lamachus. The day of Peace is Misolamachus.³⁹ In another place Lamachus is represented as shirking and standing in the way of the peasants who were busily engaged in unearthing Peace.⁴⁰ But the implied charges against him are only such as have been made against professional soldiers on many occasions since then. At the end of the play the son of Lamachus displays an inability to think or sing about anything except the glories of war.⁴¹ It would seem as though he had made himself objectionable by boasting of his father's exploits. In these references to Lamachus we can see what was more apparent in the *Acharnians*, his dependence upon the perquisites of office for a livelihood, and his military reputation.

Lamachus was a soldier, not a politician, a follower and not a leader; and as a soldier he would find himself in agreement with the party that stood for aggressive measures and a war fought to a finish. No compromise peace would satisfy a soldier who felt that an ultimate victorious peace was possible, and I imagine Lamachus was no exception. As a follower, he could only succeed in politics under the wing of some leading politician, and he had to choose between Nicias and Cleon. It was an easy choice for a soldier whose personal bravery was not tempered with prudence; and Lamachus, the protégé of Cleon, found himself in office when his patron was in the ascendancy, first in 426-5 as the result of a special election, next in 424-3 as a colleague of Cleon, and probably again in 422-1, when Cleon held the generalship a second time. If not general in that year, he at least held some official position that made him *ex officio* one of the Athenian Peace Commission to ratify the treaties with Sparta.⁴² But it is hard to think of Lamachus holding any position not connected with the army.

The next time we hear of Lamachus in the strategion, Alcibiades was at the height of his power, and the aggressive plans of Cleon had been revived. He was then chosen as the third in command of the Sicilian expedition and served on that expedition until his death.

³⁹ *Peace*, 304.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 473 f.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1270-1294.

⁴² *Thuc.*, v. 19, 24.

EURYMEDON

Another general whose career offers interesting problems is Eurymedon, serving continuously from 427 to 424, when he lost his position because of the failure of his Sicilian command, and coming out of political retirement in 414 to hold office until his death in 413-2.

Busolt has shown that his demotic was either *Ἐκαλῆθεν* or *Κεφαλῆθεν* and his tribe either Acamantis or Leontis.⁴³ As Hippocrates was a member of Acamantis and was general also in 426-5, it is almost certain that Eurymedon should be assigned to Leontis. In none of the years when Eurymedon held office did Leontis have a general, so far as our records permit us to judge. Furthermore we know that when he was not in office, some one else represented that tribe, Thucydides being the first.

Before considering the details of Thucydides' election, a few words about the previous career of Eurymedon will be necessary. His election in 427 coincides with Cleon's advent to leadership of the city demos, and his actions at Corcyra, where he showed sympathy with the ruthless democracy of the city, have linked his name with the radical Athenian democrats. In 425 he was chosen with Pythodorus and Sophocles to carry out Cleon's imperialistic plans in Sicily. When the elections of 424 took place he was still in Sicily, and knowing that Cleon's party were victorious at the polls that spring, we may accept Busolt's conjecture that Eurymedon was elected.⁴⁴ There was at that time no good reason for recalling him.

But about the time when the new generals took office, the Sicilian cities made a peace that rendered further operations in the island futile, and the Athenian fleet sailed for home.⁴⁵ Upon its arrival, the Athenians vented their disappointment upon the generals, exiling two and fining Eurymedon. His past connections were insufficient to save him from punishment, al-

⁴³ *Hermes*, XXV, 571-579.

⁴⁴ *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1. Busolt saw that there were no good reasons for thinking that the Sicilian generals failed of re-election; but he did not reason the problem through to its logical conclusion and so thought that one of them, probably Pythodorus, was defeated.

⁴⁵ *Thuc.*, iv. 65.

though they probably did save him from the exile by which his colleagues paid the penalty of failure. This trial made three vacancies in the college of generals.

When the special elections to fill these vacancies were held we do not know; but if we consider Thucydides as the successor of Eurymedon, we can best account for his election by assuming that the elections were held soon after Athens began to feel uneasy over the fate of her possessions in Chalcidice, perhaps as late as the loss of Acanthus to Brasidas. Some explanation for Thucydides' entrance into office in 424 is necessary. He had taken no great part in politics, and his conservative views were not such as would have won him support in the spring of 424 when the influence of Cleon was at its height. The disgrace of Eurymedon offered him an opportunity to enter the strategion; the failure of Cleon's policy in Sicily and the threat to the Empire in the north brought a reaction in public opinion that promised success to an opponent of Cleon; and finally Thucydides' interests on the coasts of Thrace made him the logical choice of his tribe.

After Thucydides had brought his military career to a speedy and inglorious end, there are a few years when the names of only one or two of the Athenian generals are known. Then in 420 Alcibiades, who was also a member of the tribe Leontis, began his meteoric career in the strategia, an office that he held, with the exception of one year, until his disgrace in 415. Leontis had lost two generals through exile in ten years. The fates were playing into the hands of Eurymedon, who could now offer himself as a candidate for election from Leontis with good prospects of success. Peisander had taken the place of leading demagogue once held by Cleon; and Eurymedon's experience in Sicily would make him a valuable member of the strategic board. Thus the very first year the tribe Leontis found it necessary to find a successor to Alcibiades, Eurymedon was elected to the generalship and was sent with reinforcements to Sicily,⁴⁶ where he was slain toward the end of the summer of 413.⁴⁷ In 412 another general, Phrynichus, was the choice of Leontis.

While it seems clear that Eurymedon was of the deme Hecale

⁴⁶ Thuc., vii. 16.

⁴⁷ Thuc., vii. 52.

and of the tribe Leontis, there is still to be considered the possibility that he was a member of the tribe Acamantis to which the deme Kephale and the general Hippocrates belonged. Since Hippocrates was apparently commander-in-chief in 426-5, he could have been Eurymedon's fellow-tribesman, and Acamantis might have had two representatives on the strategic board. But as we shall see when we come to consider the tribal affiliations of Nicostratus, assigning Eurymedon to Acamantis would make it necessary to assign Nicostratus to Leontis and would create difficulties without solving a single one. For example, it would be necessary to explain why Hippocrates, the nephew of Pericles and an ambitious politician of the more radical group, should not have been chosen in 427 instead of the less important Eurymedon, who was likewise radical in his views. But the inability of Hippocrates to defeat Nicostratus, the friend of Nicias, needs no explanation in a year when there was no great amount of dissatisfaction with the latter's leadership. We shall have occasion to consider a very similar difficulty, involving Thucydides, when we come to study the career of Nicostratus.

PYTHODORUS

Pythodorus, like Eurymedon, was probably chosen for the year 424-3. Busolt ⁴⁸ thinks that only two of the Sicilian generals were re-elected, because, as he says, we already know the names of eight generals for that year, and with the three from Sicily there would then be eleven. But as the premise on which he bases his conclusion is incorrect, we shall have to re-examine the evidence. We know of eleven generals who served in 424-3, not merely eight; but no one can possibly tell from the evidence at hand whether more than six of those whose names we know were elected at the regular spring elections. What Busolt and all others have forgotten is that this particular year was filled with special elections and that every special election requires us to add one to the number of generals chosen for that year. Since we have gone above ten, it is as possible to have fourteen as thirteen, on the natural assumption that vacancies caused by conviction or death would be filled.

Busolt also ventures the supposition that Pythodorus was

⁴⁸ *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1.

the one of the three Sicilian generals to be defeated at the polls. But let us consider his record. He was in command of the Sicilian expedition, having taken the place of Laches, and in the spring of 424 he had done nothing to merit the displeasure of Cleon. He may not have seen with him eye to eye on all matters of public policy, but at the time of the elections he was closely identified with one of Cleon's pet schemes, the conquest of Sicily, and would therefore be re-elected in the ordinary course of events. He had been chosen for the first time in 426 when Cleon's party had been victorious at the polls and had then been entrusted with the important task of winning Sicily. Busolt himself saw that similar arguments for the re-election of the subordinate generals Eurymedon and Sophocles were valid. They ought then to apply with greater force to Pythodorus.

But after the return of Pythodorus to Athens with empty hands, he was brought to trial, convicted and exiled. The same fate came to his colleague Sophocles, although Eurymedon, who was perhaps second in command, was let off with a fine, apparently through the influence of Cleon. Eurymedon was radical enough to deserve some consideration from the demagogue. The reason for the severity with which Pythodorus and Sophocles were treated is to be sought not in a greater degree of guilt,—for this was a political trial in which guilt and innocence were probably not the decisive factors—but in their politics.

How then did their views differ from those of Cleon? In 426 they had been with him, but since 426 party lines had changed. Men who had been able to support Cleon in a policy of active military measures were now aligning themselves with the conservatives against Cleon,⁴⁹ and it is quite likely that Pythodorus and Sophocles had in some measure suffered a change of heart since 426 and had recently come out in opposition to Cleon. Perhaps their inactivity in Sicily was due to

⁴⁹ Party lines were not so stable in Athens as modern authors have supposed; and the studies of Athenian politics of this period made by men like Beloch are almost worthless because they antedate by several years the issues that were dominant between 425 and 421. For that reason they give an incorrect idea of the political situation before 425. I have discussed this more fully in *Class. Phil.*, April, 1924, pp. 124 ff.

this change of heart which became manifest after their return to Athens when they had an opportunity to see for themselves the state of public opinion.

The tribe to which Pythodorus belonged was certainly not Cecropis, even though Busolt⁵⁰ and Beloch apparently agree in identifying the general with a man of that name from the deme Phlye. Beloch's error is in not admitting that the tribe Cecropis had a general in 426-5 when Pythodorus was first elected. Laches was a member of this tribe and remained in command of the Sicilian expedition until December or January, when Pythodorus took his place. Beloch believes that Laches failed of re-election but was allowed to conduct the operations in Sicily for about nine months after his defeat at the polls, and six months after his year of office had expired, this too at a time when dissatisfaction with the conservative generals was rife. Since he could have been recalled easily, even without the necessity of finding an excuse, if his term had expired, the mere fact that he continued to act as general for half of the official year 426-5 makes it clear that he was a legally elected member of the strategic board and not, merely one with a sort of pro-consular authority.

This makes it necessary for us to find another vacancy for Pythodorus. The only vacancy is Hippothontis, a tribe whose company of knights was commanded by a Pythodorus about this time.⁵¹

SOPHOCLES

Sophocles, the third of the Sicilian generals to be tried and punished, although probably the junior in command, received a punishment as severe as that of Pythodorus, and we may assume that the two men held the same political views. There can be no question about his re-election.⁵² As to his tribe and successor's name, we can only conjecture. Like Eurymedon, he was probably followed by a conservative. That leaves us only two men to consider, Autocles and Nicias. Autocles is really out of the question, because he was a colleague of Sophocles in

⁵⁰ *Philol.*, L, 1891, p. 91.

⁵¹ Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.*, 12405.

⁵² Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2, 1125, note 1, was the first to suggest that Sophocles was re-elected in the spring of 424.

425-4, and since he was not commander-in-chief, his tribe would not be entitled to two generals. It is true that Nicias was likewise general in 425-4, but being apparently the senior officer he could have had a colleague from the same tribe. Furthermore, in 426, when Sophocles was first elected, Nicias and the other old generals were generally defeated at the polls. Nicias might very well have been defeated also in the spring of 424, for the more one studies the situation at that time, the more convinced one must become that the victory of Cleon's party was overwhelming. Nicias took no part in the summer campaigns of 424, and in our records he does not appear as active in the strategion until after the loss of Amphipolis made possible negotiations for a truce.⁵³

Demodocus might be considered as a successor to Sophocles despite his politics, except that he held a command at the very beginning of the official year, that is before there had been time for the auditing of Sophocles' accounts, his trial, and the election of a successor. Furthermore, all tribes except that of Nicias are out of the question for similar reasons, or because generals from those tribes served as colleagues of Sophocles in one or another of his official terms. Beloch has pronounced against the identification of Sophocles the general with the member of the Thirty by that name, of the tribe Oeneis, and rightly too in my opinion, for Sophocles would then have been a colleague of Lamachus in 426 and again a colleague-elect in 424.

⁵³ The tribe of Nicias was also the tribe of the more renowned Sophocles the poet. In this connection it should be noted that the incident related by Plutarch in his *Life of Nicias*, chap. 15, in which Sophocles the poet appears as a junior colleague of Nicias proves that once at least when Nicias was the senior general he had a fellow-tribesman named Sophocles on the strategic board with him. But since this episode is not at all appropriate where it stands in the midst of the story of the Sicilian expedition, it would seem as though it had been taken from some Sicilian source and perhaps had been told originally of the other Sophocles who had tried to conquer the island nearly ten years before the fatal expedition. It would have been a simple matter for Plutarch to ascribe it to the poet. As this is the only intimation that the poet ever held the generalship during the Peloponnesian War, the authenticity of the story has been questioned. But applied to Sophocles the general, the story might very well be true.

HIPPOCRATES

Hippocrates serves as a sort of barometer of political fortunes in Athens at this time. He was a general on two occasions, first in 426 and then again in 424. Both times the radical democracy won a decisive victory. It seems strange to find the nephew of Pericles working hand in glove with Cleon, but undoubtedly for an ambitious youth co-operation with the demagogue would prove the path of least resistance to political office. There was a dearth of military ability among the supporters of Cleon, and all recruits from the aristocracy would be welcome, especially one who could bring the prestige of the Periclean name to the radical cause. The more conservative elements of the state had recognised leaders who were loyally supported, even though not entirely worthy of the position in which they found themselves. It would be difficult for Hippocrates to displace them in public confidence except as an opponent relying upon the support of the city democracy and upon the growing dissatisfaction at the lack of success of their policies.

As Hippocrates' election was followed by a radical change of military policy on both occasions, it seems probable that he stood on a platform of more aggressive operations and that he hoped through military successes to win an assured place in Athenian politics. But his inglorious Boeotian campaign in 424 resulted in his death at Delion and a reaction that brought his opponents back into power.

The tribe to which Hippocrates belonged, Acamantis, is of particular interest because it was also the tribe of Pericles. To whom did it give its confidence when Hippocrates was not in office and whom did it choose to take his place after his death? We may assume that the political rival of Hippocrates was a man of some prominence in the state. Otherwise, Hippocrates with his advantages would have had a secure position on the strategic board. Against a weak candidate the assistance of the radicals would have been unnecessary, and furthermore a weak candidate would have been unable to defeat him in 425 when the spirit of imperialism was still strong in Athens. If we can find a man who took office as a general shortly after the death of Pericles, was elected in 425 when Hippocrates was defeated, and finally was again general in the spring of 423, we need not

hesitate to consider him as a rival of Hippocrates and a member of Acamantis, provided, of course, he does not belong to some other tribe.

NICOSTRATUS

The career of Nicostratus fulfils these conditions precisely, for he too was a barometer of public opinion. He was elected first in 428 or 427,⁵⁴ holding office until the radical victory of 426. Then in 425 he returned to office. In 424 the tables were turned again, but after the disasters of the summer a conservative reaction set in which restored the influence of Nicias, Nicostratus, and Autocles. None of these took part in the operations of the second half of the summer of 424, but all of them signed the truce with Sparta,⁵⁵ and the first two were given command of the important expedition sent out for the recovery of Scione and Mende.⁵⁶ Since the tribes of Nicias and Autocles are known, they can not be considered the successors of Hippocrates, and since all of the other known generals of this year served before his death or at least in the early winter immediately after it, there is only one possible conclusion, *viz.*, that Nicostratus is the eleventh general chosen to take the place of his unfortunate rival.

Furthermore, careful study of the years in which he was general shows that he can not have belonged to any tribe except Acamantis, for at one time or another he had colleagues from each of the other tribes, with the possible exception of Leontis to which we have assigned Eurymedon. We must still consider the possibility, mentioned above, that Eurymedon belongs to Acamantis, in which case Nicostratus must go to Leontis. But if that were true, it would be necessary to explain why the unknown Thucydides should have been preferred to the honored Nicostratus, both being conservative in their views. Nicostratus had the further advantage of being in office when the election took place. We know that he was trusted, for he was elected to fill a vacancy later in the year and held an important command. If he and Thucydides were fellow-tribesmen, he must have been

⁵⁴ Beloch prefers 428, which would make him an immediate successor to Pericles.

⁵⁵ Thuc., iv. 119.

⁵⁶ Thuc., iv. 129 f.

chosen to take the place left vacant by the historian when he went into exile. But there is not a single reason for accepting this hypothesis, not even Thucydides' Thracian connections, for the elections came several months before Brasidas threatened to destroy the empire in Chalcidice.⁵⁷

The defeat of Nicostratus by Thucydides would be very difficult to explain, but the election of Thucydides to fill out the term of Eurymedon and the victory of Hippocrates over Nicostratus offer no problems. Nor is the election of Nicostratus after the death of Hippocrates at all surprising. When public opinion began to turn away from Cleon to Nicias, and when Cleon was powerless to prevent the truce with Sparta, the thoughts of all would incline toward the trusted friend and former colleague of Nicias.

According to Beloch,⁵⁸ Hippocrates held the presidency of the board of generals in 424-3. It is possible that Nicostratus was his successor in this position. Thucydides has given us a transcript of the truce with Sparta and a list of the plenipotentiaries who ratified it.⁵⁹ It is evident that we possess a copy of the original document. Those who ratified the truce on behalf of Athens were Nicostratus, Nicias, and Autocles, Nicostratus taking precedence over Nicias in the list. Unless he held a position superior to that of Nicias, his name would normally be placed second. Under ordinary circumstances, Nicias was the more important of the two men and his name would occur first to the mind of the historian. That the order is reversed on this occasion is further reason for accepting Thucydides' copy of the truce as accurate.

The more normal order is found in Thucydides' account of the expedition sent out to recapture Mende and Scione.⁶⁰ The

⁵⁷ Commentators on Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 81, have thought that Nicostratus was from the deme Scambonidae, but this hypothesis has not found general acceptance. If we are wrong in assigning Pythodorus to Hippothontis, there is a possibility that Nicostratus belonged to that tribe, but there is no reason for preferring this assumption to the one offered above. On the contrary, it would be more difficult to reconstruct the list on that basis.

⁵⁸ *Att. Pol.*, p. 282.

⁵⁹ *Thuc.*, iv. 119.

⁶⁰ *Thuc.*, iv. 129.

author had no need to consult official documents here, and as we should expect, he gives the place of honor to the more famous man. Even on this expedition, it is possible that Nicias actually held a subordinate position, for on two occasions Nicostratus was in charge of the main operations. Once Nicias led what was apparently a feint attack, while Nicostratus with the bulk of the troops advanced against the defenders of Mende from another direction.⁶¹ A second time Nicostratus conducted the siege, while Nicias led a raiding party into the surrounding country.⁶² Thucydides may have unconsciously inverted the order of names because of the greater renown of the junior general.

Nicostratus was again general in 418, when he and Laches lost their lives at Mantinea. His tribe now found it necessary to choose a new man. He had monopolised the office for so many years, except for the two short intervals when Hippocrates was general, that no man of experience was available. As we should expect, in 417-6 Acamantis was represented by a man whose name has not appeared in our records before, Teisias of Kephale.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the spring elections of 424 really resulted in a decisive victory for Cleon's candidates, almost all of whom were successful; but after the return of the generals from Sicily a reaction set in from which the conservative candidates, Thucydides, Nicostratus, and perhaps Nicias, profited at the special elections. This reaction grew in force until Laches and Nicias were able to persuade their countrymen to accept a truce with Sparta, greatly to the discomfiture of Cleon and the imperialists.

ALLEN B. WEST.

WHEATON COLLEGE,
NORTON, MASS.

⁶¹ Thuc., iv. 129.

⁶² Thuc., iv. 130.

III.—LATIN QUANTITATIVE SPEECH AS AFFECTED BY IMMIGRATION.

The handbooks on vulgar Latin usually convey the idea that after Plautus the folk-speech flowed underground Arethusa-like to escape the Tullian Alpheus, and finally gushed forth in sweet fountains of romance. This figure, of course, overstates the hypothesis, but it will serve to illustrate my objection to a linguistic theory which reaches simplicity by disregarding important social and racial changes that very decidedly influenced the Latin language of the Empire. It would be more nearly correct to use as a basis of comparison the Mississippi River which has to accept in mid-stream the drainage of the Chicago canal as well as the yellow torrent of the Missouri. Processes of change observed in Petronius, in second-century inscriptions, or in the Itala versions of the Bible may be similar to those observed in Plautus, but they are not necessarily a direct continuation of these, and they are very often due to wholly different circumstances that originated in the Empire. The culture of the period extending from the Gracchi to Augustus flowed wide and very deep, and effectively checked most of the currents of decay noticeable in the colloquial phrases of the early comedy. It was not only that schools became more common, that an extensive literature was disseminated which fixed the norms of language, and that for economic reasons household slaves were generally taught to read and write, but also that thousands of political and judicial speeches delivered in the open Forum before the populace by magistrates, lawyers, and candidates for office set the fashion of correct pronunciation. For example, in the meanest inscriptions of the Augustan period final *m* and *s* which had threatened to disappear two hundred years before are usually written, the quantities have become quite constant, the tendencies known as iambic shortening and syncope have apparently been largely checked. The cultured classes at Rome had imposed their speech upon the people in some such manner as the dialect of the Ile-de-France was later imposed upon the people of medieval France.

The new dissolution which accounts for the late "vulgar Latin," posited as a basis of the Romance tongues, set in dur-

ing the early Empire and was hastened by the circumstances of that day. The cause of this new decay must be sought in the presence of a great horde of foreign peoples at Rome and all over the west, a foreign mob mostly speaking the Greek *κοινή* and never quite assimilated. There were now no public speeches in the Forum to set the standard of correct speech, the large households of slaves were now being managed by trusted freedmen who gave their commands in Greek, the quarters of the emancipated slaves in the Subura and Trastevere had become centres of Greek and Oriental speech or of badly mangled Latin. By the time of Marcus Aurelius, the emperor himself is found writing his textbook of morals for his people in Greek, assuming apparently that he will reach a larger public by using that language than Latin.

How thorough-going the changes in the population of Rome really were we have usually failed to consider, despite the frequent references to them in Tacitus and Juvenal. It is only by taking a census of the names on Roman tombstones that we are driven to accept the fact that in Hadrian's day not much over ten per cent of the population of Rome was actually of Latin stock, and that even in the country villages of Italy, in cities like Milan of north Italy, Narbo in Gaul, and Cadiz in Spain, the proportion of Greek and Oriental names runs to about fifty per cent.¹

This is not the place to explain the process by which such a revolution had taken place. We are concerned now with the meaning of this fact for the history of the Latin language. To understand the influences at work upon the language at this time one might study the English that has developed in the "Dutch" settlements of Pennsylvania and in the Italian colonies of any of our cities. Our public schools eventually save the language. At Rome the assimilative powers of a strong culture over peoples ambitious to slough off the signs of humble birth accomplished something in the same way. But they were not quite penetrative enough for the task. Petronius has fortunately left us a record of what this freedman Latin was like when used by half Romanized men of Asiatic Greek origin.

¹ See *Race Mixture in the Roman Empire*, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 1916, 689 ff., and *An Economic History of Rome*, 149 ff.

It is a jargon full of Greek words, phrases, and proverbs, even of puns that reveal a Greek origin, of Latin nouns whose genders are changed, partly through the influence of corresponding Greek genders, and partly through the loss of the original inflectional endings. It also falls into Greek constructions like *dicere quod*,² into Semitic proverbs,³ and the use of pitch accent⁴ instead of the normal Latin stress accent. It is apparent from inscriptions also that the vulgar Latin which was being formed in the first two centuries of the Empire, while conserving a few of the republican colloquialisms, owes its origin to new factors introduced in the Empire. To be sure, it also operates with syncope, confusion of quantities and neglect of inflectional endings, but the process is now of the thorough-going kind which appears when a foreign group is only half attempting to adopt the language of a native people.

The third century brought few new slaves to the West, and genuine Latin might well have recovered some of the ground it had lost if it had not been for the political corruption of that century which weakened the forces of the native culture. As it was, the third century provided time for some normalization of the new colloquial speech. The descendants of the immigrants gradually sloughed off various Grecisms of vocabulary and syntax and shaped in time a humble but standard usage which spread through most of the empire. This Latin of the people knew little of correct quantity, boggled inflectional endings badly, and, as a result of losing the feeling for inflections, had on the one hand to resort to analytical phrases⁵

² Salonius, *Vitae Patrum*, 1920, 299 ff. This construction is a Grecism first freely used in Latin by Petronius in his parody of immigrant-speech. The only instance before him is found in the *Bellum Hispaniense* which probably comes from the report of a slave secretary.

³ Cf. Friedländer, *Cena Trim.*² on *sociorum olla*, 38.

⁴ See *Class. Quart.* 1910, p. 36.

⁵ In early Latin, prepositions served chiefly to distinguish from each other the various functions of each case, while in the Empire, when inflectional endings were breaking down through ignorance of the forms, the prepositions were extended to distinguish between case and case. It is clear that in the Empire the movement toward an analytical structure was an effect not a cause. In fact analytical language is usually an indication of a people's subjection by conquest or immigration.

with the help of prepositions, on the other to abandon the old malleable word order and adopt a stereotyped⁶ order in which subject, adjective, verb and object could always be found where expected.

From the reestablishment of order by Diocletian and Constantine there resulted a period of peace, a new output of literature, wider reading, and a vigorous production of grammars and books of comment which for a time rescued the speech and overcame the dominant force of the new colloquial Latin. It is probable that colloquial speech remained fairly stationary in the fourth century and that the new cultural forces exerted a decided check upon the tendency toward disintegration. However, during the fourth century there was doubtless a great difference between literary and colloquial speech, and the writers, by their stilted and artificial use of earlier models, show clearly enough that literary Latin is not the language of the home and the street.

In this and the following century, however, there were two influences at work that left a strong mark upon the language of the people. Of some importance is the fact that many eloquent preachers, born in the provinces but fairly well schooled in correct Latin preached throughout Italy and the West in sentences that mingled Christian-Greek and Oriental turns of phrase with a half colloquial, half literary Latin. Of greater influence is the fact that almost the whole western world was now dominated by Teutonic invaders, who while slowly adapting Latin words and accents as best they could to their own customs of speech, once more played havoc with the inflectional endings of the Latin speech which the culture of the fourth century and the preachers of the fifth had done not a little

⁶ The ubiquitous theory that the "modern" order has been adopted because it is more logical than that of inflected languages obscures the actual process of change. In the Itala versions the "modern" word order has already established itself, not because it is more logical than that of Caesar, but because the populace of the third century, whose speech these represent, could not trust their sense of case forms to the extent of employing a malleable order. The fixed order here indicates that the native users of the language have been overwhelmed by a people that never fully learned the language. It is a proof of subjection as much as in our own English language. Jespersen, *Language*, p. 344, is wholly inadequate on this point.

to rescue. Then came the three dark centuries out of which finally emerged the Romance languages.

Such are the social vicissitudes which the linguist must bear in mind in discussing vulgar Latin. As we have seen, Latin is obviously not a steady stream flowing from Plautus to the age of Charlemagne; indeed the stream as it first appears in 200 B. C. is nearly dammed up in Cicero's day. Then a broad river flowing in from the east athwart its course carries it in a new direction. In the third century this current grows wide and shallow, as it were, and again in the fourth it is half controlled once more, when in the fifth its waters are swept off by a flood from the north. This is, of course, an inadequate metaphor, but what I wish to emphasize is the great need of more detailed study of folk-Latin, period by period, giving less attention to the supposed development of Republican colloquialisms, paying more attention to the peculiar processes at work in the Petronian period, and distinguishing between the immigrant wave of the early Empire which was Syro-Greek and that of the late period which was Teutonic.

We may also add that the constant search for remnants of the Oscan-Umbrian dialects in Italy and for the remains of Celtic in the Po valley must be quite futile. Similarly, the remnants of Greek in the language of Provence during the fourth century are to be sought not so much in the old Masiot speech as in that of the large body of slaves that were imported after Caesar's day to the Roman colonies of Lyons, Arles, Nîmes, and Narbonne. In Africa, on the other hand, where Gracchus planted a colony and where Punic-speaking natives provided much of the labor, we may look for some Republican colloquialisms mixed with Semitic fashions of speech. In Spain where Latin spread widely during the Republic and where Greek slaves were never as numerous as in Italy we may also look for some remnants of old Latin, since colonies are apt to be conservative in speech. But outside of these two areas the influence of Plautine diction is not to be expected.*

* The graffiti of Pompeii and the *tabulae devotionum* of the early Empire are not illustrations of true vulgar Latin connected with Plautus. The humbler folk of Pompeii were largely Greek and Oscan, and the *tabulae* in question were generally written by eastern slaves.

Again, the Greek elements in the Latin language should be more closely scrutinized. The early Greek words that came in through commerce with Cumae and Sicily should be set apart; next the learned words of the Ciceronian period; then the corrupt Greek that the slaves of the early Empire brought chiefly from Syria, Egypt, Cappadocia, Pontus, and neighboring provinces, and then finally the elements contributed by the Christian preachers, the popular educators of the fourth and fifth centuries. Throughout all this period standard Greek phonology, morphology, and syntax were of course changing, and what is worse, during the period of slave importation at least, many forms of corrupt Greek were spoken in Italy.

Such are the intricate problems that the student of colloquial Latin must face if he is to write a story that is to be in any way plausible to the student of Roman society. At present I shall confine myself to the question of what bearing this series of social changes has upon the problem of quantitative versus accentual rhythm in Latin. It should be apparent at once that the orthodox theory which finds a direct connection between the hypothetical early Latin accentual verse and Comedian's *quasi-versus* is by no means reasonable if the stream of colloquial speech between the two is not continuous.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, it may be well to say at once that I agree with most scholars in considering Saturnian verse and the meter of Republican comedy quantitative and not accentual. As for Saturnian it seems to have felt the influence of word stress enough to have become somewhat confused by the prehistoric shifting of the Latin accent from the initial syllable to the positions called for by the new penultima custom, but the accentual theory has here been raised only by those who are seeking support for accentual theories elsewhere. As regards Plautine verse, Bentley showed that Plautus was not wholly insensitive to word accent, an observation to which Ritschl added much proof. Lindsay, in the excellent Epilogue of his *Captivi* massed the evidence so effectively that some of his readers began unguardedly to call Plautine verse accentual, or at least to believe that Plautus' quantitative verse was an artificial imitation in an unnatural form and that the author seemed more at home in accentual rhythms. But Lindsay's

own denial of this possibility was as explicit as it has been in his more recent utterances.⁸ It affords no excuse for such an interpretation. Word accent was admittedly a factor in the composition of some of the Plautine rhythms, but it has now been shown by careful statistics⁹ that it did not influence ten per cent of the feet. Plautus, like all Latin poets of the five centuries following him, wrote quantitative verse.

The question will, of course, continue to arise in countries where accent decidedly controls rhythm. In France and Italy where word stress counts for less in poetry, scholars fret but little about the question. We, of course, are not in a position to know intuitively what Greek and Latin quantitative verse was like. Tennyson is reported to have said that he knew the quantity of all English words except "scissors," but the efforts of the present poet laureate to lay down and follow rules of quantity in English lead to results that justify skepticism. Yet in Plautus' day every village smith knew his quantity except, naturally, in so far as individual words were in a fluid state. The existence of the penultima law, imposed, of course, by popular pronunciation before the day of literature and schools, proves that the accurate sense of quantity was acquired by children in their earliest efforts at speech. When literature came into being quantity was a fact, whereas accent had but recently been shifting from one position to another.¹⁰ Under such conditions it is not surprising that rhythm should take cognizance of quantity rather than of word accent. Furthermore, quantity continued to be the basic fact in the

⁸ The phrase "a wonderful agreement between ictus and accent," Lindsay, *Captivi*, p. 361, must be read in the light of what is said on p. 373, "We must never forget that the metre of Plautus is quantitative metre." The note in A. J. P. 1921, p. 335 seems to me misleading in bringing Bridges' *Ibant Obscuri* into the comparison; but in his *Early Latin Verse*, pp. 18-33 there is no room for misinterpretation.

⁹ Sturtevant, *Class. Phil.* 1919, 234 ff. The complete percentages are not given in his excellent paper; the figure is the result of my attempt to combine his results.

¹⁰ In Chaucer's day many words of French derivation had not yet been shaped to the English mold. Chaucer, for instance, accents *hónour* and *honoúr* in consecutive lines. This seems to me an apposite parallel.

pronunciation of Latin. The lyrics of Catullus and Horace, and the hexameters of Lucretius and Vergil take no serious notice of the accent,¹¹ and even prose orations not only respected quantity throughout but even formed the clausulae on the basis of quantity, not accent.¹²

The accentual theorists have built heavily upon a few lines of ribald soldiers' songs quoted by Suetonius,¹³ but it is noteworthy that the quantities are correct in these. But that soldiers in making marching songs in stressed trochaics should have emphasized the beat by adding accent to length is not remarkable. Except for these soldiers' songs, however, the Latin verses that may be called popular, as for instance the children's ditty cited by Porphyrio (Hor., Ep. I, 1, 62):

Rex erit qui recte faciet, qui non faciet rex erit

are always quantitative and never wholly accentual. In fact, there is no purely accentual Latin poetry before the fall of Rome.

By the second century A. D. the population of Rome, as we have seen, was largely foreign in origin, and the process of assimilation was now very slow. From the humbler verse inscriptions of the third century it is evident that in the folk-speech the quantitative pronunciation of Latin broke down. Of course, the inherent processes revealed to us in early Latin verse could not have brought this about. In Plautus some inflectional endings were being abbreviated by a natural process and in iambic words the long syllable tended to become short. But other quantities remained firm and fixed—so fixed indeed that in Cicero's day when a Greek actor, insufficiently trained, missed a quantity the whole crowd jeered. The slave diction of the Empire presented quite a different situation:

¹¹ Sturtevant's valuable statistics on the Latin Hexameter, *Class. Phil.* 1919, 375 ff. are based upon the supposition that Vergil did not consciously follow a rule calling for a masculine caesura. If we believe in the caesura, as I think we must, we can explain a large percentage of "conflicts" by it, and in that case we arrive at somewhat different results.

¹² On the nature of the word accent, which apparently contained the elements of stress as well as pitch, see *Class. Quart.* 1910, p. 26.

¹³ Suet. Jul. 49, 51, 80; Caligula 6; Galba 6; Schlicher, *The Origin of Rhythmical Verse*, Chicago Diss., 33 ff. has well analyzed these verses.

long vowels in any position appear sporadically short and vice versa.

Now quantitative pronunciation is not a thing that disappears by chance. For ages the Latin language had so generally conserved its long and short vowels intact that unless an adequate explanation is found we are very loath to recognize relationship of Latin words with those of cognate languages unless the supposed cognates have the same quantity. Since quantities were so firmly fixed how could the sense of them have been so completely lost in the early Empire? The loss could not have been due to the barbaric invaders of the 5th century since our inscriptions prove that the change took place before they came. Nor was it due to presence of the stress accent, for it occurs in all positions. It can be explained only on the hypothesis of a strong influx of foreigners who failed to acquire the correct pronunciation.

A great many of the imperial verse inscriptions are, of course, entirely correct. It is difficult to find flaws in the official ones, for instance; moreover, from the constant repetition of trite epitaphial commonplaces, it is apparent that many inscriptions were manufactured on older models. Perhaps the dealers in grave-stelae kept sample books of ready-made verses that could be quickly adapted. Such verses, quite correctly made, appear even upon tombs of very humble folk. However, the normal verse inscriptions of the third century betray a very feeble sense of quantity. I shall take three which reveal by their attempt at following standard rules of verse-writing that the composer was in each case not wholly ignorant. They will serve to illustrate our point as well as to explain the technique of Commodian, who while ignorant of quantity had done something to brush up on verse forms. These three are *Carmina Epigraphica*¹⁴ 546, which Buecheler places somewhat before 300

¹⁴ Two are in hexameters, one in elegiacs, the favorite verse forms for epitaphs. All three are from Rome. No. 546 bears at least a name of dignified appearance, Antonia Severa; 656 is the epitaph of a diaconus, 1339 may betray Greek connections in the spelling *vibat*. In 656 I have disregarded the first two lines which are distorted to admit intractable names. Other hexameter inscriptions of peculiar interest in the treatment of quantity are C. L. E. nos. 422, 429, 443, 470, 473, 474, 484, 492, 495, 511, 525, 541, 562, 587, 610, 629, 640.

A. D., C. E. 656, about 300 A. D., and C. E. 1339 B, somewhat after 300 A. D.

546

- Me propter maria, terras atque aspera caeli
sidera trasisti mediosque timenda per hostes
inuenisti viam, hiemis nefanda tulisti,
o dulcis coniunx animo gratissima nostro.
5 nomine consimilis, iugali flore beata,
casta pudica meos thalamos ac fomite amoris
nondum suppleta cubilia sancta liquisti.
saltem quod superest oro, scio namque fauebis,
funde preces subolum ac uotis utere nostris,
10 ut longum uitae liceat transducere tempus.

656

- Cubiculum duplex cum arcisoliis et luminare
iussu papae sui Marcellini diaconus iste
Seuerus fecit mansionem in pace quietam
sibi suisque memor, quo membra dulcia somno
5 per longum tempus factori et iudici seruet
Seuera dulcis parentibus et famulisque
reddidit (octauo) Febrarias uirgo kalendas.
quam dominus nasci mira sapientia et arte
iusserat in carnem, quod corpus pace quietum
10 hic est sepultum, donec resurgat ab ipso
 quique animam rapuit spiritu sancto suo,
castam pudicam et inuiolabile semper
quamque iterum dominus spiritali gloria reddet.
quae uixit annos (nouem) et (undeci) menses,
15 (quindecim) quoque dies. sic est translata de saeclo.

1339 B

- 11 hic Probina iacit gracilis cito rapta marito
 diebus paucis uix commodata suo.
inuida sors rerum, fatis quid mergis aceruam
 nec te coniugii nouus flectit amor?
15 heu miseranda nemis, auspiciis iuncta sinistris,
 quo fato traderis, hoc seuiante peris.
quid, Probina, prosunt fecunda uiscera tibi?
 concepis adfectum, luctum et ipsa parit.
nil te danna nocent communis funere leti,
20 cum tuus in nostro pectore uibat amor.

In these poems, as in Commodian's, a conscious effort is made to respect the masculine penthemimeral caesura and to use only words with two or three syllables at the end of the

hexameter. No great effort is made to keep the correct quantity in the syllable before the caesura, the end of the two half lines being treated almost alike in this respect, as in *Commodian's* verse. In the penultimate syllable before the caesura the quantity is usually correct, but this is probably not due to any particular regard for this syllable but to the fact that knowing the penultima law the writer had in the accent a ready-made clue to the quantity of an unusually large number of penults. The same is true for the sixth arsis which is always a penult under accent and therefore reveals its quantity in a large number of instances. Scholars who assume that *Commodian* knows his quantities because they usually fall correctly in these positions have failed to see this point.

That in the three poems above the rhythm rests upon quantity, and not upon accent, is revealed by the large number of conflicts between accent and ictus as well as by the correct use of syllables that are long by position. The exceptions in the latter class usually occur in lines that have to provide for proper names; a few are due to cases of weakened or intractable word-ends, and a few to instances of double consonants, which were apparently pronounced as single by the author (cf. 1339 l. 12, comm.). False quantities in the interior of words are frequent, both in accented vowels (656 *sibi, quoque*; 1339 *novus, auspiciis, traderis, prosunt, tibi*) and in unaccented vowels (546 *nefanda, iugali, cubilia, liquisti*; 656 *cubiculum, luminare, severus, parentibus, sepultum, pudicam, spiritali*; 1339 *diebus, sevienti* [9 lengthened, 4 shortened]). From these phenomena it is apparent that writers who were not ignorant of the rules of standard verse, of orthography, accent or grammar, who knew also that quantity lay at the basis of verse and who were willing to respect it when the accent gave them a clue (there is no case of a polysyllable used with the wrong penult), nevertheless were unable to write quantitative verse correctly for the simple reason that the correct feeling for quantity had generally disappeared. We know, of course, from the behavior of various sounds in the Romance languages that Latin quantities before disappearing had somehow influenced the quality of various vowels, but this qualitative distinction was apparently not associated with the old quantitative differences by ordinary people at the end of the third century.

With these inscriptions in mind we are now ready to comprehend what Commodian¹⁵ was trying to do in writing his peculiar hexameters. Elaborate theories that miss the mark have been built up regarding his verse through an attempt to connect him with the Plautine stream rather than with the immigrant Latin which originated in the Empire. Hanssen¹⁶ considered Commodian's verse quasi-accentual but found in the ends of the half lines a respect for quantity which did not fit his main theory. W. Meyer¹⁷ attributed the peculiarities in them to a Syrian custom of syllable-counting modified by a desire for regular clausulae. Vroom,¹⁸ realizing that Commodian never acquired an accurate feeling for quantity, assumes that he simply adopted the rhythm of the Latin hexameter from reading Vergil, and that this rhythm (given the caesura, the penultima law, and the use of two- and three-syllable words at the line-end) produced a verse which was half quantitative. This theory is perhaps the best that has been offered, but it seems to me to reverse the important factors.

The secret of Commodian's verse is simply that as a foreigner who had never acquired a precise feeling for quantities he did the best he could with the quantitative system with which he had some theoretical acquaintance. He had made so much progress in the Latin language that he knew most of the word accents, though not all; so, for instance he apparently accented *estote* and *tollatur* on the first syllable and therefore inferred that the penult was short. From grammars he had learned several of the rules of standard verse-writing; e. g. that the caesura should be masculine penthemimeral, that the end of

¹⁵ The date of Commodian, which is still being vigorously disputed (see Schanz III², p. 399), does not concern the argument. I have discussed his quantities as an illustration of what might occur at any time after the native sense of correct pronunciation had gone. Though he is more negligent of syllables long by position than any of the three inscriptions quoted above he reveals the same tendencies as these. In the treatment of metre he has more in common with the tendencies that are apparent about 300 A. D. than with the customs of the fifth century.

¹⁶ Hanssen, Diss. phil. Argent. 1881.

¹⁷ W. Meyer, Abh. Münch. Akad. 1885, p. 288; *Fragmenta Burana*, p. 149.

¹⁸ De Commodiani Metro et Syntaxi, Groningen, 1917.

the line should be made of two- and three-syllable words, and that consequently (because of the penultima law) quantity and accent are in peculiar harmony there. He noticed that two consonants make position as in Greek, though in the interior of the line he often disregarded the fact and sometimes he apparently mispronounced double consonants as single ones. He refused to spend much time on word-ends, especially if they were at the caesura. He knew that diphthongs were long, but sometimes where our manuscripts write *ae* he apparently wrote *e*, which in many cases he assumed to be *ē*. Much has been made of the fact that his quantities are usually apt to be correct in the syllable before the third arsis, in the sixth arsis, and in the two syllables before that. But the inscriptions quoted above have shown us that the normal accent on penults and antepenults gave a ready clue to many quantities in these positions. Even in those inscriptions, where no special effort to be meticulous as regards these places is apparent, the quantities naturally fall with unusual accuracy there. Commodian consciously tried to achieve correctness in these critical positions and this he could do without great difficulty. By using his knowledge of length by position, his memory of words that he had observed in reading Vergil, and by inferring quantities from accents in three-syllable words he could readily strike the right quantity for most words needed in these final positions. A few others he was willing to dig out of books. In the rest of the line, when memory or the clue of accent failed him, he made no effort to be accurate. In the first few lines of the *Carmen Apologeticum criminose* is used as though it were $\cup \cup - -$; *gratias* = $\cup \cup -$; *sopiti* = $\cup - -$; *saginati* = $\cup \cup - -$; *statim* = $- -$; *primae* is pronounced *primē*. His quantitative errors average more than two per line. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the verse is generally intended to be quantitative; at least there is no other rhythmical principle apparent in his lines. Whatever may be the date of Commodian, his verse like that of the inscriptions, reveals precisely what was becoming of the Latin quantities in the third century when there were few of the native stock left to speak the inherited language correctly.

If these observations concerning Commodian and the popular

inscriptions are correct, we need not attempt to explain the third century rhythms by reference to an old hypothetical accentual system. In intention the verse is still quantitative though an accurate sense of quantity has failed to survive because the populace of Rome and Italy is no longer Latin.

In the fourth century there is a noticeable reversal to an artificially correct quantitative verse on the inscriptions as well as in literature. A renewed study of Vergil and other classical authors in the schools with the use of the recent commentaries of Donatus and Servius induced a respect for accuracy. It is difficult to believe that the pronunciation of people in their daily intercourse was much altered by such factors. But in composition correct fashions even if quite artificial had to be complied with. The epitaphs of the lowly show a certain regard for all the rules. After Donatus no writer ventured to publish verses exhibiting as little feeling for quantity as Commodian's.

It is probable that even scholars were now more aware of word accent than of quantity, and there is certainly in iambic and trochaic verses of the fourth and fifth centuries a larger persistence of accents and ictuses "in harmony" than there had been in the Augustan period. But no one seemed as yet to have thought of writing verse that was entirely based on accent. Ambrose, who created an abiding model for church hymns, esteemed scholarship too highly to disregard quantity though he wrote his hymns for popular singing and perhaps saw to it that the accent for which the people had a feeling should not be too often placed in a confusing position. For a hundred years that norm was followed quite regularly. But even when harmony between accent and ictus became conspicuous, especially in trochaic lines, this, as Schlicher¹⁹ has noticed, is not so much due to a conscious deference to accent as to an extraneous cause. In writing a song in trochaics where the second and fourth theses are licenced positions (e. g. *Sed oremus sedule*) the difficulty of managing the word endings induced the poet to arrange his words in such a way as to place those syllables if possible in the licensed positions. Diaeresis of course results after the first dipody. As a natural

¹⁹ *The Origin of Rhythmical Verse*, p. 55.

result of that (given the penultima law) harmony between ictus and accent ensues if the writer is careful of his quantities. Hymns that are demonstrably based upon accent rather than upon quantity do not occur until after the German tribes have taken possession of most of Italy, Gaul, and Spain. If after their coming the hymns gave less heed to a quantity no longer correctly pronounced and more to a word accent—which was of course prominent in the speech of the Teutonic conquerors—we have only one more proof of phonological change due to change of race. But this phenomenon, of course, has no connection whatsoever with any real or hypothetical rhythm in early Latin.

What I have tried to show then is that in one circumscribed field of Latin grammar at least we shall have to study linguistic change from the point of view of the great racial changes of strikingly diverse kinds which altered Roman society century by century. The field of study suggested by this point of view is very large. Passing beyond the problem of quantity we must examine particularly the influence of the eastern servile immigrant on phonology, morphology and syntax, on the structure of the language and even on the color of literary style.²⁰ And finally we shall probably find that the mystery religions are practically confined to the people who came from the homeland of such religions, that medieval mysticism which is manifest even in the second century has its root in the temper and psychology of these migrants, and that the eastern folk-tales which spread through the west were to some extent brought in by slaves and captives long before Rome's fall.

TENNEY FRANK.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

²⁰ Frank, *A History of Rome*, pp. 468; 505: Fronto, Apuleius; 508 ff.: Religion; 565 ff.: The Causes of Rome's Decline.

IV.—AENEID IV, 551: MORE FERAЕ.

Servius solves this all too easily by reference to the lynx, which according to Pliny never takes a second mate; it matters little that we cannot locate the quotation; in a note to 458 he prefers the wolf. Quintilian in IX, 2, 64 follows the same line: Est emphasis etiam inter figuras cum ex aliquo dicto latens aliquid eruitur: ut apud Vergilium

Non licuit thalami expertem sine crimine vitam
degere more ferae . . .

Quamquam enim de matrimonio queritur Dido, tamen huc erumpit eius affectus ut sine thalamis vitam non hominum putet sed ferarum. This adds obscurity to difficulty and we rather think that Conington misinterprets the interpretation. However, the note seems to mean that Dido rebels against marriage as a human institution and longs for the regardless promiscuousness of beasts. Ladewig and Schaper so explain it, building on Livy III, 47, 7: placet pecudum ferarumque ritu promiscue in concubitus ruere? Others adduce Horace, *Sat.* I, 3, 109:

quos venerem incertam rapientis more ferarum

Yet this is only a verbal aid.

To this line of explanation we raise several objections: first, it is unpoetical and disgusting, and it may be remarked that in matters of taste and judgment we need not bow even to Quintilian, much less to Servius; second, it is inconsistent with the immediate context and quite out of character so far as Dido is concerned; third, it is superficially grounded so far as the phrase itself is concerned.

Leaving to one side the judgment of Servius, let us take a bit of his data: Three times he tells us that the word Dido in the Punic language signified virago (I, 344, IV, 335 and 674). A glance at the lexicon shows that this term was applied to Diana, Minerva, and the queen of the Amazons, all instances of resolute virginity; Virgil himself so denotes Juturna in XII, 468. There is little doubt that he knew the etymology of the word and built his character consistently with it, combining several threads of sentiment in his usual manner.

He represents the queen as having taken a vow of chastity to her first husband, which touches the Roman sentiment of honor for the 'univira.' It is likely also that he was not unconscious of the story that Dido immolated herself rather than marry Iarbas (Servius, I, 344), for even the story that a poet rejects will influence his conception of character. Thus Virgil found Dido's character fairly well sketched; what he did was to add a tragic genealogy and to modify the incidents. In the lines preceding our passage she lays the blame for her fall upon Anna; this is unjust but it is dramatic and quite natural for one whose happiness is going to wreck by a victory of the feelings over the will:

Tu lacrimis evicta meis, tu prima furem
his, germana, malis oneras atque obicis hosti.

Then follows *Non licuit*—just as she had said *Per te non licuit*—. It is her broken vow that hurts and the shattered ideal of proud virginity. This cult of virginity, if we may so name it, we think is expressed by the word *fera*, Italian *fiera*.

One turns naturally to Metabus and Camilla, and especially to this couplet, XI, 567-568:

Non illum tectis ullae non moenibus urbes
accepere neque ipse manus feritate dedisset.

This word *feritas* is translated *fierezza* by the Italians and denotes the haughty pride of the Italian bandit, who even in the recent war would not bow to conscription, and won the admiration of his fellow-countrymen by the fact. Thus *feritas*, even in Virgil, seems to denote not only the life in the wild but also the pride of the outlaw who sets up that standard of living. The same word is used by Hirtius, *Bellum Gallicum* VIII, 25, of the Treviri, who, he says, never obeyed commands unless compelled by military force. It is not going far to assume that the modern Italian words *fiero* and *fierezza* have fallen heir to this popular element of significance in *ferus* and *feritas*. It must be recalled that Servius remarks in his preface to this book that the style is almost comic, which can only mean that it is almost colloquial.

It remains to show that *fera* may be used without a noun

to denote a woman, which is not difficult, for Bacchantes are so denoted by Ovid, *Metam.* XI, 37. However, we are more interested in a passage of the *Ciris*, which may be Virgil's own: Ll. 83-86:

Ausa quod est mulier numen fraudare deorum
et dictam Veneri votorum avertere poenam,
quam mala multiplici iuvenum quod saepta caterva
vixerat atque animo meretrix iactata ferarum.

The text is bad but the meaning is absolutely clear. According to this version of the Scylla legend the creature, although a prostitute and under a vow to Venus, had boasted herself to be one of the *ferae*, doubtless a devotee of Diana surrounded with a bevy of hounds, and for a punishment was transformed into a monster of the familiar tradition with hounds of a different sort about her. There is trouble in taking *iactata* as a deponent verb but the interpretation is so clear that *ferarum* can only mean those devotees of Diana to whom the daughter of the old nurse in this same poem belonged. Recall vv. 307-309:

Numquam ego te summo volitantem in vertice montis
Hyrkanos inter comites agmenque ferarum
conspiciam nec te redeuntem amplexa tenebo.

This type of proud virginity, which Virgil elaborated in the Camilla episode and exalted in the complex tragedy of Dido, was very much in his mind from youthful days, and not less in the public mind. Among the plots collected by Parthenius for Cornelius Gallus, numbers XV and XXXVI are notable examples. In this phase of sentiment seems to be found the only consistent, poetical interpretation of *more ferae*.

NORMAN W. DEWITT.

V.—AENEID I, 599, *EXHAUSTIS* OR *EXHAUSTOS*.

So far as I have observed, modern critical editions exhibit the ablative, annotated editions the accusative; the latter is the reading of all MSS except F.¹ The difference of case involves a difference of sense; which sense is more likely for Virgil?

Haurire and *exhaurire*, like English “drain,” mean either “draw out or off,” or of a receptacle “empty”; in the latter use the content of the receptacle is merely implied, but may be expressed, as in Cic. Pis. 86, Luc. 9, 171, id. 4, 303 and 638, with which two passages cp. Colum. I praef. p. 17, ed. Bip. *exsucto sudore*, Sen. Ep. 108, 16, *exinanire sudoribus* and especially Sen. Ep. 51, 6.

Donatus, quoting *exhaustos*, explains by *inopes*. For *exhaustus* sc. *opibus*, “impoverished,” cp., besides Lewis & Short, Cic. Har. Resp. 37, Pis. 96, Nep. 7, 8, 1, Verg. G. 4, 398, Liv. 1, 57, 1, 26, 35, 5. The rendering of modern editors, “exhausted, worn out” implies *viribus*. English can speak of “exhausted strength” or of a person or thing as “exhausted,” i. e. drained of strength. The corresponding expressions occur in Silver Latin: *vires exhaurire* or *exhaustae*, Val. M. 3, 4, 4, 3, 7, 10, Curt. 7, 9, 14, 8, 14, 36, Sen. Ep. 84, 2, Sil. 10, 378, Plin. Ep. 3, 19, 6; *exhaustus* = *confectus*, *fessus* Curt. 4, 16, 18, Stat. Th. 2, 37, 5, 420, Silv. 3, 3, 156, Ach. 2, 401. I hesitate to include Luc. 2, 340 and Stat. Th. 7, 748. The first is paralleled by Plin. N. H. 18, 189, and Lewis & Short’s rendering of Pliny’s *exinanitur* by “exhausted, weakened,” like the *defetigare* by which Nonius explains *haurire* in Georg. 3, 105, spoils the vividness of the original. With the second passage cp. Sen. Ep. 63, 11 and Plin. Ep. 6, 16, 6 where also the participle of the abl. absol. amplifies a description which would have been sufficiently completed by the simple ablative of the noun.

For *exhaustis* we have the interpretation of Serv. Dan.: *veteres sic dicebant ‘clades hausi’ id est pertuli*. Caesar writes *supplicium ferre*, B. C. 1, 84, 4, s. *perpeti*, ib. 2, 30, 2; Virgil has *supplicia hausurum*, Aen. 4, 383. *Labor* and *periculum* are used with *tolerare* in Sall. C. 10, 2, with *haurire* in Tac. H. 3, 84. Of *exhaurire* I find twelve instances: with *bellum* or an equivalent, Aen. 4, 14, 11, 256 (*bellando exhausta* as passive

of *bello passus*, Aen. 1, 5), Liv. 33, 11, 6, cp. *ferre* and *tolerare* in Hor. Ep. 1, 18, 55, Aen. 8, 516, Ov. Her. 8, 26; with *periculum*, Aen. 10, 57, Ov. Met. 12, 161, Tac. H. 4, 32; with *labor*, Liv. 21, 21, 8, 26, 31, 7, Sil. 17, 350; with *labor* and *periculum* combined Liv. 21, 30, 9, 25, 31, 7, 33, 39, 6. A synonym of *exhaurire* is *exanclare*, used by Cicero and earlier writers with the objects *clades*, *aerumnas*, *labores*, and later by Apuleius, who employs it, Met. 11, 2, in an ablative absolute, *saevis exanclatis casibus*, which looks like an archaized reminiscence of Virgil's phrase.

That Virgil wrote *exhaustis casibus* is strongly indicated by the Apuleian passage and by the fact that *exhaustus* = *fessus* seems not to occur before the Silver Age. And that this use was in fact unknown to Cicero and Virgil is suggested by *effetum corpus*, Cat. M. 29, and by *effeta senectus*, Aen. 8, 208, beside *exhausta senectus* in Statius' imitation, Silv. 3, 3, 156. It is indeed conceivable that Virgil, knowing this use of *exhaustus*, rejected the word in favor of one containing a more violent metaphor; for Cicero this seems less probable.

It must be observed, since neither Lewis and Short nor Vollmer on Stat. Silv. 1, 1, 18 make the necessary distinction, that *exhaurire* may have other meanings with *labor* and *bellum*. With *labor* it is used in two other senses: *consumere*, Liv. 5, 5, 6, 44, 39, 6, Sen. Ep. 52, 5, Luc. 3, 495, Plin. Ep. 3, 9, 1, 5, 5, 7; *conficere* or *peragere*, Ov. A. A. 1, 771, Stat. Th. 6, 236, 10, 36 (Georg. 2, 398 is not quite parallel, see Conington's note on the personification of *labor* by the dative). In Stat. Silv. 1, 1, 18 *armis exhaustis* = *bellis confectis*; so Liv. 32, 3, 4, Sil. 6, 155 (cp. Ov. F. 2, 482). *Exigere* also = *conficere*, e. g. Aen. 6, 637, so that *exacti fili*, Stat. Silv. 5, 1, 57, and *exhausti fati*, ib. 3, 40, are parallels. Like *exigere* and *consumere*, *exanclare* is found with an object denoting a period of time; the only example of this that I have noted for *exhaurire* is Tac. A. 4, 29 (cp. Aen. 2, 795). Finally I note that in one passage, Pl. Capt. 1009, *exigere*, like *exhaurire* and *exanclare*, is a synonym of *ferre*.

Page on Aen. 4, 14 renders *bella exhaurire* by "drink to the dregs the miseries of war." The metaphorical use in Rep. 1, 66 and Ph. 11, 10 shows that *haurire* = *bibere* was familiar to Cicero. But Hor. S. 1, 2, 78, *unde laboris plus haurire mali est*,

shows the same metaphor as S. 1, 1, 52, that of drawing from a source; and Cicero's *haurire dolorem*, Sest. 63, Cael. 59, *h. calamitatem*, Dom. 30, Tusc. 1, 86, may be explained in the same way (cp. Ger. *Mut schöpfen*). Greek ἀντλῆν and its compounds appear not to have the sense "drink"; and it seems reasonable to suppose that in *exanclare* Latin took over not only the Greek word but also the Greek metaphor and continued the latter in *exhaurire*.

W. H. KIRK.

RUTGERS COLLEGE.

REPORTS.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA, VOL. L
(1922).

Pp. 1-11. C. O. Zuretti. La lettera di Nicia (Thuc. VII 11-15). A study of Nicias' report on the military situation in Sicily—a report written, apparently, in all good faith—with references to the two long speeches in Diodorus, XIII 20-31, and the two orations of Aristides, XXIX and XXX.

Pp. 12-19. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. Studi sull' accento greco e latino. XIII. Della pretesa sintomia vocalica latina con geminazione consonantica. Remarks on the supposed coexistence of such forms as *litera*, *littera*. The writer examines the theories of Brugmann, Sommer, Thurneysen, Vendryes, and Ahlberg. The doubled consonant cannot be explained as a compensation for the shortening of the preceding vowel. The explanation must be sought rather in the breaking-down of Latin quantity, and the consequent strengthening of the accent.

Pp. 20-37. Giuseppe Corradi. L'Asia minore e le isole dell' Egeo sotto i primi Seleucidi. II. Antioco II e le città greche dell' Asia. Apparently, Antiochus II treated the Greek cities of Asia Minor more liberally than his predecessors had done.

Pp. 38-54. Santi Consoli. Studi intorno agli scolii di Giovenale e di Persio. Lists of passages of Vergil, Horace, and Lucan, cited in the Scholia on Juvenal and Persius. A defense of the reading of *Pithoeanus* (*P*) in Juvenal, II 1, *Ultra Sauromatas fugere hic libet*, etc. Cp. Sat. XV 84, *hic gaudere libet*. 'Hic' may mean, "nella presente occasione, in siffatta circostanza, in tale condizione di cose, ora, etc."

Pp. 55-66. Luigi Castiglioni. Studi Anneani. IV. Note critiche ai libri delle Questioni Naturali.

Pp. 67-75. R. Sabbadini. I doppioni lirici di Orazio. Comments on some of the Odes of Horace. I 9 is made up of two inconsistent parts (1-12, 13-24). I 28 gives two variations on a single theme. I 24, IV 2, III 4, have each two apostrophes in a single ode. IV 2, IV 6, I 7, each contain two odes. Similar comments on III 4, I 3, I 6, III 16, III 23.

Pp. 76-80. A. Rostagni. Per la critica dell' *Ibis* (Risposta al signor A. E. Housman). Reply to criticism of a recent study of the *Ibis*.

Pp. 81-123. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 124-138. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 139-140. Necrology: Carlo Salvioni (died at Milan, Oct. 20, 1920).

Pp. 141-144. List of new books received.

Pp. 145-148. Vincenzo Costanzi. Il più antico nome di Empoli. The oldest name was *Empolum* or *Empulum*. The name *Emporium* occurs first in a document of 1485.

Pp. 149-171. Giuseppe Ammendola. Note e questioni di critica ermeneutica ad Aesch. *Eumenidi*. Discussion of lines 64, 134, 142, 217-18, 220, 310 ff., 336, 377-80, 403-05, 413, 470-75, 499, 522 ff., 550 ff., 946 ff., 980-83, 995.

Pp. 172-76. Carlo Pascal. Landica. Cicero, Fam. IX 22, 2, suggests that the quantity is *landica*. The word may be derived from a root *ladh-*, 'hide.'

Pp. 177-191. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. Studi sull'accento greco e latino. XIX. L'accentazione delle parole greche in latino.

Pp. 192-96. Ettore Stampini. Terenz. *Andr.* 236 e 625. *hōcine* od *hōcine*? At 236 read *hōcine*; at 625, *hōcine*.

Pp. 197-227 and 335-363. Benedetto Romano. Il significato fondamentale dell'aoristo greco studiato negli *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* di Senofonte. A review of various modern teachings as to the fundamental meaning of the Greek aorist. To the writer, it indicates "la pura e semplice idea verbale, indipendentemente da ogni concetto o relazione di tempo." A study of the aorist in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.

Pp. 229-256. Reviews and book notices (Antoine Meillet, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, Ed. II; T. Frank, *An Economic History of Rome*; H. H. Bender, *A Lithuanian Etymological Index*; etc.).

Pp. 257-283. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 284-288. List of new books received.

Pp. 289-306. Vincenzo Costanzi. La durata della terza guerra messenica. The war probably lasted only three years, and ended in 461. Thucydides may have written (I 103, 1) that the Messenians surrendered *τρίτῳ ἔτει*, and an Alexandrian critic changed the statement to *δεκάτῳ ἔτει*, to bring it into accord with a later tradition.

Pp. 307-334. Gaetano Munno. La 'Pesca' di Oppiano. Analyses of the various books of the *Halieutica*, comments on Oppian's similes, etc. The parallel between Hal. V 1 ff. and Sophocles, *Antig.* 332 ff. was indicated by Conradus Rittershusius, in his Leiden edition, 1597.

Pp. 364-372. Reviews and book notices (Karl Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache*; John A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*; etc.).

Pp. 373-381. Reports of classical periodicals.

Pp. 382-384. List of new books received.

To mark the completion of its fiftieth year, the *RIVISTA* adds to this volume a general summary of the original contributions printed in its pages from the beginning. This summary (in 248 pages) is compiled by Professors Domenico Bassi, Carlo Oreste Zuretti, Benvenuto Terracini, and Uberto Pedroli. After twenty-five years of able and honorable service, Professor Ettore Stampini retires from the editorial chair, and a 'new series' is to begin under the care of Professors Gaetano De Sanctis and Augusto Rostagni.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE XLVI, 3-4; XLVII, 1-2.

XLVI, No. 3. Classified list of reviews that appeared in 1919 and 1920. By J. MAROUZEAU.

XLVI, No. 4. Classified report on articles published in periodicals. By J. MAROUZEAU.

XLVII, Nos. 1-2.

Pp. 5-41. Aug. Mansion, *Étude critique sur le texte de la Physique d'Aristote* (L. I-IV). This is a study of the Latin version—derived from the Arabic—appended to the Latin editions of Averroës' commentary. There is a later version by Moerbeke († 1286) and a still later one by Joannes Argyropulus († 1486), the latter reprinted in Bekker's edition of Aristotle (Berlin, 1831). The Latin of the Moerbeke version renders the Greek word for word and follows the tradition represented by MSS F G H I, especially I. This tradition is inferior to that of E, so that the Moerbeke version, though equivalent to a manuscript, is of little value as far as the Physics is concerned. The version of Argyropulus is poorer still and, like Moerbeke's, departs from E and is nearer to F G H I, but of these it most resembles F; any unique readings it has are due to the astuteness of the translator. Since the text of Aristotle has fared still worse in translations from Arabic into Latin, it would, at first sight, seem useless to seek critical help in such versions. An attentive study, however, of the Latin translation from the Arabic of the first four books of the Physics leads to an exactly opposite conclusion. M. Mansion discusses the questions of a

Syriac intermediary between the Greek and Arabic versions, of a Hebrew intermediary between the Arabic and the Latin, and of a Spanish intermediary between the Arabic and the Latin. If such existed there is no proof that they had any important influence on the Latin version. The author concludes that the translation found in the Latin editions of Averroës, though far from the original Greek, was made to replace older and faultier versions. Faults were introduced by Renaissance editors, and in the Venice edition of 1560 the text has been revised after the Greek. Hence the critical value of this version is limited. However, it presents a number of remarkable ancient readings found in the Greek commentaries from the third to the sixth century. From the agreement between such passages in this version and in E we see that we are in the presence of a well-established text of Aristotle of the 8th or 9th century, a text superior to that of the tradition of F G H I, etc. Where this version and E have a common reading that differs from the reading of another group of MSS, this common reading must be regarded as the oldest and most authentic text of Aristotle, unless proof to the contrary be given on the basis of internal evidence or of indirect ancient tradition.

Pp. 42-44. H. de la Ville de Mirmont. Cicéron, Act. in C. Verrem Sec. Lib. III, XXXVII, 85. In this passage historical considerations and manuscript evidence lead the author to suggest the following reading: *Itaque qui tot annis agellos suos redimere a piratis solebant, idem se ipsos te praetore a te pretio imposito redemerunt.*

Pp. 45-49. A Guillemin, Quelques corrections au texte de Cornélius Népos. The author proposes the following corrections: *Thras.* 1. 4, for *ad vires vimque* pugnantium read *ad vires casusque*. *Timoth.* 3. 5, read: *populus acer, suspicax, ob eamque rem nobilis adversum reos invidus, etiam potentiae <inimicus> domum revocat; in crimen vocantur, accusantur proditionis.* *Milt.* 5. 3, read: *acie e regione instructa a parte non apertissima* proelium commiserunt. *Phoc.* 2. 4, read: *concidit autem maxime uno crimine, cum apud eum summum esset imperium populi Atheniensium, quod, cum Nicanorem Cassandri praefectum insidiari Piraeo sine quo Athenae omnino esse non possunt a Dercylo moneretur, . . . Phocion negavit esse periculum.* *Iph.* 1. 4, read: *Idem thoracas pro sertis atque aënis linteos dedit.*

Pp. 50-57. Max Niedermann, Notes critiques sur quelques textes médicaux latins. The author treats three passages of *Anthimi de observatione ciborum epistula*, eight passages of

the Additamenta Pseudo-Theodori ad Theodorum Priscianum, and seven of the Mulomedicina Chironis.

P. 57. L. Havet, Cicéron, Brutus 24; 44. Critical notes.

Pp. 58-64. Georges Mathieu, Deux manuscrits méconnus de la *Rhétorique à Alexandre*. The MSS are the Bergomensis and the Matritensis, the former ascribing the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* to Isocrates, the latter to Aristotle. The author compares readings of these two MSS with those of the eleven MSS used by Hammer, and concludes that without bringing in much that is new they help to fix the text of the preface in certain points and supply useful information as to why the Rhetoric, the work of Anaximenes, was assigned to different authors.

Pp. 65-73. J. Marouzeau, Sur la "qualité" des mots. The author maintains that in the study of synonyms one should consider not only the sense, but the value, color, quality and sphere of the words. He illustrates his view by two examples. I: homines—mortales. Primarily, *mortales* distinguishes men from gods, as in the epitaph of Naevius, *Immortales mortalis si foret fas flere*; secondly, from the rest of nature, as in Sallust, Jug. 20. 3, *multos mortales cum pecore atque alia praeda capit*; thirdly, it denotes 'the totality of mankind, as in Cicero, De Fin. III 3. 6, *omnes mortales, qui ubique sunt*. There is the further distinction that *mortales* as contrasted with *homines* is oratorical, poetic, emphatic, and it prefers a qualifying expression denoting misery, infirmity, suffering. II: filius, liberi—natus, nati. *Liberi* designates the children collectively as compared with the parents. *Filius* has an official and juridical significance indicating descent. *Natus*, in the majority of cases, seems to have the value of a term of endearment, assuming later an archaic and poetic tinge because of its long use in dactylic verse as a more emotional doublet of *filius*.

Pp. 74-83. Louis Havet, Notes critiques sur Eschyle. In Pers. 960, for *Σουσιस्कάνης* read *Σοῦσις*, which M. Havet believes to have been changed to *Σουσιस्कάνης*, a name found in line 34. In Pers. 1004, for *ἰὼ ἰὼ* read *Ἰάνων*, as in the corresponding line 1011. In Pers. 1020, for *τάνδε* read *ταυδε* = *τῷδε*. In Sept. 116, for *ἀλλ'* read *ἰλαος*. In Sept. 587, for *χθόνα* read *'ς αἰεί*. In Sept. 617, read *εἶπεν* for *οἶδεν*. In Sept. 964 read *δάκρυμ' ἴτω*. In Sept. 999, read *δυστόνων ἀρχηγέται* for *δυστόνων κακῶν ἀναξ*. Prom. 425-435, a passage which the author believes to have belonged originally to another tragedy, is emended.

Pp. 84-96. Bulletin bibliographique.

Pp. 97-107. A. Diès, L'échelle finale des biens dans le Philèbe. M. Diès argues at great length in favor of reading

at Plato, Philebus 66 A, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν πῇ περὶ μέτρον καὶ τὸ μέτριον καὶ καίριον καὶ πάντα ὅποσα τοιαῦτα χρὴ νομίζειν τινὰ ἥδιον ἢ ῥῆσθαι for the Vulgate χρὴ τοιαῦτα νομίζειν τὴν αἰδίων εἰρῆσθαι φύσιν. After having independently arrived at his reading the author found in W the marginal note (on τὴν): γρ. κ. ἥδιον, with the word *τινα* written above ἥδιον.

Pp. 108-140. Louis Havet, Notes critiques sur Eschyle. This is an investigation of the particles *τε* and *δέ* from the point of view of textual criticism. The author has studied every instance of *τε* and *δέ* found in the critical apparatus of Mazon's first volume of Aeschylus (which includes all the plays except the Oresteia). M. Havet finds that the alterations affecting *τε* and *δέ* fall into three classes: 1) indirect errors; 2) direct errors affecting the grammatical construction; 3) direct errors not affecting the grammatical construction. In the first class the copyist is led astray objectively by the error of some one else; in the second class, subjectively by his own misapprehension; the third class deals with gratuitous errors and involves only the faulty omission or addition of the particles in question, never the substitution of one for the other. The author gives copious examples of each of the three classes and then arranges the entire body of examples in the order of their occurrence in the Aeschylean text, adding wherever necessary a more detailed discussion of individual cases.

Pp. 141-143. W. Deonna, Aristophane et l'Athéna d'Avenches. The author believes that, in the very beautiful bronze statuette of Athena found at Avenches in 1916, we have a new example of the influence of works of art on ancient literature. As the original of this statuette comes from the school of Phidias, it antedates the Knights of Aristophanes and may have inspired the Sausage-seller's dream of Athena coming down from the citadel with the owl on her head and pouring ambrosia and garlic-sauce from a vase (verses 1092-1096). There is an owl on the helmet of the statuette, and M. Deonna thinks that the missing object held by the left hand, extended as if pouring something, was the vase.

Pp. 144-151. André Boulanger, Lucien et Aelius Aristide. Noting that Lucian was a contemporary, perhaps an auditor, of Aristides, the author finds many analogies in their writings due neither to chance nor common sources. In the Piscator and the Fugitivi, the attacks on the philosophers seem to be derived from the invective against them in the *ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων* of Aristides. Possibly Lucian knew this discourse and heard it delivered. Certain it is that the plan and the tone of the three works are similar. Both authors attack the inconsistency, arro-

gance, greed and uselessness of false philosophers. After citing illustrative passages in support of the foregoing view, the author takes up the question of the relation of Lucian's *De Saltatione* to Aristides' two invectives against the theatre. He concludes that there is nothing to show that Lucian's treatise was meant as a reply to Aristides.

Pp. 152-163. A. Ernout, *Tempore puncto*. The author takes issue with the statement of H. Diels that the language of Lucretius is not only archaic and popular but in some passages downright vulgar and that Lucretius, like Varro, remained a real rustic. M. Ernout contends that much of the work of Lucretius was inspired by the life of the city, by its tastes, progress, refinements and vices. Taking up the expression "*tempore puncto*" (*puncto tempore*, *puncto . . . in tempore*), which Diels considers a vulgarism for *temporis puncto*, the *s* being suppressed before the consonant and the *i* changed to *e*, M. Ernout maintains that *tempore* is not a genitive but an ablative and that *puncto* is a participle and not a noun. As regards the phrase *temporis puncto* (*temporis in puncto*), which is also used by Lucretius, M. Ernout thinks that this expression differs from the synonymous expression, *tempore puncto* and variants, very much as *ante occasum solis* differs from *ante occasum solem*.

P. 163. L. Havet, *Cicéron, Brutus* 87; 97; 99. Critical notes.

Pp. 164-176. *Bulletin bibliographique*.

CAROL V. B. WIGHT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS.

Hellenen und Barbaren. Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins. By JULIUS JUETHNER, Leipzig, 1923. Pp. viii + 165.

This subject has long interested classical historians and philologists, ever since the appearance of Steinhofer's *Dissertatio critica de voce βάρβαρος*, Tuebingen, 1732. It has been discussed in several recent *Programms*, most completely by A. Eichhorn, *Βάρβαρος quid significaverit*, Leipzig, 1904, and B. A. Mystakides, *Αἱ λέξεις Ἑλλην, Γραικός, Ῥωμαῖος, Βυζαντινός*, etc., Tuebingen, 1920. The more recent work of J. A. K. Thomson, *Greeks and Barbarians*, London, 1921, has, despite its title, a very different purpose.

The author is Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Innsbruck, and is best known for his writings on Greek athletics, notably for his two standard works, *Ueber antike Turngeraethe*, 1896, and *Philostratos ueber Gymnastik*, 1909. The present study lies in the field of cultural history, forming Volume VIII of the elaborate series *Das Erbe der Alten*, which is under the general editorship of Otto Immisch. The object of the book, which is divided into nine chapters and contains 342 critical notes, a short bibliography, and an excellent index, is to trace the ideas which correspond with the terms "Hellene" and "Barbarian" down through the centuries from Homer to the twelfth century of our era. Its presentation is so compact and comprehensive that it is difficult in a few words to give an adequate account of the contents.

The subject is introduced by a discussion of the derivation of the word "barbaros." Against a Semitic origin recently urged by E. Weidner, who connects it with Babyl. *barbaru* and Sumerian *bar* (*Glotta*, IV, 1912-13, 303-4), Dr. Juethner follows most authorities in finding it good Indo-European, connected with Skt. *barbarah*, *balbalā*, Latin, *balbus*, *balbutio*, and Slav. *blb*. (Boisacq, *Dict. étym.*, 114 and 111; Curtius, *Griech. Etym.*,⁶ 290 f.; etc.), and its basic meaning "stammering" "unintelligible in speech." Survivals of this early meaning occur in later Greek literature to describe the inarticulate sounds of animals (*e. g.*, in Aristophanes' *Aves*, 199; *cf.* Posidonius in Strabo, XIV, C 661), and in magic formulae. Homer uses the word only in a compound (of the *barbarophonoi* Carians, *Il.*, 2, 867). After the Persian wars the term took on its secondary meaning of inferiority, and included all peoples behind the Greeks in culture or liberty. The term "Hellene," on the other hand, is found in Homer to designate a part of

the Greeks (*Il.*, 2, 684), Hesiod first using it in a national sense (*Erga*, 528). The two terms gradually became and remained sharply antithetical.

It was in the fifth century B. C. and largely through the influence of Hecataeus, Hippocrates, and especially Herodotus, that the Greeks began really to know foreign peoples (Ch. II). But it was the Sophists who, starting from the physical similarity in all men, first proclaimed the evangel of human equality and freedom by nature, thus giving a rational basis to the concept "barbarian." But their contemporaries, the tragedians and Aristophanes, continued to teach the superiority of Greeks over barbarians as being based on natural law. Plato (Ch. III), despite his philosophic vision, followed the lead of the Sophists only haltingly, for he regarded only such foreigners as lived among the Greeks as not barbarians. His national spirit, so evident in the Hellenic ideal at the base of the *Republic*, kept him from carrying the new idea to its logical consequences. And while the Sophists had taught that "free" and "slave" were merely the result of custom, Aristotle continued to defend the national prejudice that the difference between them was natural, and, therefore, that slavery was reasonable. Alexander, however, (Ch. IV) with his idea of amalgamating Greeks and Orientals could not follow his great teacher's advice to be a friendly leader to the ones and a brutal despot to the others. The ideal of the Sophists was first developed (Ch. V), though in a narrow Greek way, by Isocrates and the Atticists, who taught that "Hellene" was no longer a connotation of descent, but of culture. Such an idea was far from cosmopolitanism, for it merely contrasted Greek with the Attic Greek, and thus, instead of extending the term "Hellene" to include barbarians with Greek culture as Plato did, the Atticists narrowed it to fewer Greeks than before, i. e., to those only who had Attic culture. At the same time they extended the idea of "barbarian" to include Greeks without that culture.

A truer cosmopolitanism began with the idealism of foreigners which resulted from Alexander's attempt to Hellenize Asia (Ch. VI). While the political ideal of Plato and Aristotle was grounded in the old Greek *Polis*, the followers of the Sophists—Cyrenaics, Sceptics, Cynics—proclaimed a World State. Thus the Cynic Diogenes called himself the "first cosmopolitan." The Stoics promulgated the idea, even though their State was still the Greek world (*oikoumene*), which since Alexander's day reached only as far as the Greek language. So while trying to do away with the distinction between "Hellenes" and "Barbarians," the Stoics really failed, for they selected only such barbarians as enjoyed Greek culture and customs. But their

cosmopolitanism was no longer restricted to cultured Greeks, but extended to all men cultivated in the Greek fashion.

In Chapter VII the author traces the status of the Romans in the old formula "Hellenes" and "Barbarians." He finds that the word "barbarian" had about the same development in Rome that it had in Greece, being long applied (*e. g.*, by Plautus) to the Romans themselves. The Greeks began to differentiate the Romans from barbarians only after the Hellenization of Italy. But still in Dio Cassius' time Greek writers used a threefold division into Greeks, Romans, and barbarians, which continued largely till the Byzantine period, when finally the "barbarians" were only the peoples on the fringes of the Graeco-Roman world, Gauls, Germans, etc. At first the Christians were "barbarians" to both Greeks and Romans (Ch. VIII), just as non-Jews were heathen to the Jews. By the time of the Fourth Gospel, however, there were Jews, Christians, and heathen—the latter including Greeks and Romans. Still the old concepts "Hellene" and "Barbarian" kept up, the former, however, gradually designating pagans. Thus, while before Alexander's time "Hellene" and "Barbarian" connoted a national cleavage, and under his successors a cultural one, under Christianity there were only Christians and pagans.

The most interesting chapter in the book is the last, "The Byzantine Age," in which Dr. Juethner discusses the later history of the concepts "Hellene" and "Barbarian" along with such other terms as *Helladikoi*, *Italikoi*, *Graikoi*, *Latinoi*, and especially the complete change wrought in the meaning of "Romans" to signify Greeks. From Justinian's day the Empire rapidly became Greek, all traces of the earlier Latin hegemony disappearing by the ninth century. But the names "Roman" and "Romans" continued to mean the Eastern Empire and its peoples. So "Roman," originally a political term limited to the Latin West and its peoples, and under the Emperors including both East and West, in the Byzantine period became an ethnic term to include the peoples of the East. Since these were predominantly Greek the name—in its Greek form "*Rhomaioi*," came to mean Hellenes.

On page 108 the author reminds us that our custom of speaking of "Byzantines" and a "Byzantine Empire" is a misnomer, as it does not rest on old linguistic usage, according to which the Byzantines were always the inhabitants of the capital, the Empire being known as Rhomaic and its peoples *Rhomaioi*. Survivals of these names still exist in the East, not only in the well-known designation of the modern Greek dialect as "Rhomaic," but, in the form *Rûm*, the name of old Rome lives on in Turkish and Arabic. Thus the Turks still call the Greeks by this name, and the Arabs of Palestine and Syria

call the adherents of the Orthodox Church by it without any reference to nationality, just as they call Roman Catholics "Lâtîn." As the Turks were the inheritors of the political power of the Eastern Empire, the old name in a political sense descended to them. Thus the Seljuk Empire at its foundation at Konia in the eleventh century was called "Rûm," and the name Rumeli (Rumelia) still appears in European Turkey, and the Sultan is still Rûm-Pâdischâhi—"Roman Emperor," to his Asiatic subjects, and the Turks of Europe are Rûm-milleti—"Roman people" (see Mystakides, p. 24).

On p. 109 Dr. Juethner gives as one of the last examples of the use of the word "Hellene" a quotation from the treatise *De adm. imp.* of the tenth-century Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus to the effect that the Mainotes of Laconia, who, the Emperor says, were descended from Greeks and not slaves, were called "Hellenes" because of their pagan practices, first becoming baptized in the reign of Basil I (876-886). But this passage has a far greater historical interest than this, for it is the last example chronologically of a Greek community becoming converted to Christianity.

A slight error appears on p. 69 (and note 168), where it is stated that the Olympic chariot victory of Tiberius Claudius Nero—the later Emperor Tiberius—was won "probably in 1 A. D." It is almost certain that it fell in 4 B. C., a date largely deduced from the inscription on the recovered base of the Emperor's monument at Olympia (see Dittenberger and Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, 1896, Nos. 220-221; and H. Foerster, *Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen*, 1891-2, No. 601).

In conclusion it may be said without exaggeration that Professor Juethner has laid every student of ancient life and culture under deep obligation by this excellent and authoritative study of the long history of the concepts "Hellene" and "Barbarian."

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Hermann Dessau, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit* (Erster Band, bis zum ersten Thronwechsel). Weidmann, 1924. 585 pp. 18 marks.

At last a Roman History of the Empire is in prospect, and that too by the foremost authority on Roman inscriptions. If the proportions of the present volume are adhered to, we shall have four or five wellpacked volumes at least; *macte virtute!*

The reign of Augustus, of course, does not lend itself to narrative composition, for the first emperor had to devote his tedious fifty years to organizing, reforming, and devising machinery of administration. This volume, therefore, true to the spirit of the reign, is not a history in the usual sense of the word. Neglecting the chronological order, it gives a series of encyclopaedic chapters on such diverse topics as government, finances, army, building operations, religious and social reforms, military campaigns, and the succession. What facility the author commands in effective narrative is still to be seen. If in this volume the style seems to lack carrying force, if the investigator's fidelity to minutiae and the topical organization of his material seems to preclude panoramic views, it is doubtless due to the nature of the subject. After all, there are thousands who can tell a story, while there is probably no scholar to-day who equals Dessau in his command of the more abstruse sources of imperial history and in the comprehension of the many imperial institutions, the details of which are revealed chiefly by the inscriptions. Without carping, we may perhaps express the hope that in future volumes space may be given the author for a much fuller citation of his sources, since it is apparent that these volumes will be used for decades as reference books.

Dessau's sane conservatism finds frequent expression. He has little patience with Mommsen's theories that a vital change in governmental practice created a "dyarchy" in 23 B. C., that Augustus accorded the senate new judicial powers, and that he claimed personal ownership in provincial soil after 27 B. C. Dessau also rejects Eduard Meyer's recent hypothesis of a "principate" modelled upon Pompey's sole consulship, and his thesis that Caesar and Augustus invited divine honors for political reasons. In all these matters he gives a persuasive and well documented account of his position. However, in this last instance one feels that reaction to a previous over-statement has perhaps betrayed him into under-estimating the importance of the imperial cult. Occasionally, when he refers to republican history, he seems to fall into hasty judgments and lapses of memory, as when he admits a republican issue of gold coins only during the Second Punic War (p. 203), when he writes that soldiers had never been used for non-military labor before Augustus (p. 161), and when he insists (p. 153) that Gaius Gracchus by policy exploited the provincials.

Dessau's profound scholarship ranges far, but he has nevertheless limited himself rather rigorously. One who can so conclusively arrange the skeleton of facts might well be asked to venture a formal reconstruction of the whole anatomy, but Dessau is very chary of large conclusions. There is no attempt at portraying the Augustan government in action, there is no

picture of Augustan society, and there is hardly a hint concerning economic conditions except in the sphere adjacent to public finance. Literature is treated only in discussing the relation of authors to Augustus and Maecenas, and the chapter, though full, is frigid and inconsequential. Of the artistic and intellectual life outside of that, little is given.

However, present-day historians usually overstrain their capacities by trying too much, and Dessau's last chapter is proof that conscientious reserve was prudent. In his chosen field he has given so much more than any other historian that criticism of the limits of scope would be ungracious. He has produced a standard reference book that every student of Augustan politics, economics, society and literature should have at his elbow.

TENNEY FRANK.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Galenī De sanitate tuenda, De alimentorum facultatibus, De bonis malisque sucis, De victu attenuante, De ptisana. Ediderunt KONRADUS KOCH, GEORGIUS HELMREICH, CAROLUS KALBFLEISCH, OTTO HARTLICH. Lipsiae et Berolini in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MCMXXIII. Pp. lxiii + 552. \$8.24.

This is volume V, fascicle 4, 2 of the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum. It is a reassuring circumstance that, despite the difficulties of the times, the publication of the Corpus still proceeds, though retarded. It is announced that the second part of Paulus Aegineta is in the press and soon to appear: as conditions improve it is to be hoped that the publication of the whole will proceed at an accelerated rate.

The contents of this volume are so varied that a detailed criticism is impossible. In order to appraise the worth of a critical edition, it is necessary to use it continuously for a considerable time; for, aside from the degree of completeness with which the editor presents the ms. tradition, the value of his work consists in his good judgment, which approves, or fails to approve, itself only as the reader finds one difficult passage after another wisely or unwisely treated. On this score the competence of Helmreich and Kalbfleisch has long been established. In the work of Koch and Hartlich I found points to question; but I prefer to defer judgment on them until I have given the matters maturer consideration.

To many the most interesting part of the volume will be the collection of prefaces. Every one who has occupied himself with

Galen knows how unsatisfactory Kuehn's edition is, and will want to know whether the new Corpus will prove to be a great improvement on our previously available texts. The answer must be unhesitatingly in the affirmative: one may now proceed with considerable confidence in dealing with Galen, so far as his works have been reëdited. But finality, even in the collation of MSS. and versions, has not yet been attained. It is disquieting to find that publications, on which Diels had to depend in his survey of the MSS., prove to be at fault in more than one instance; and it is fairly certain that even important MSS. exist which have been neither listed nor collated. When the Corpus was undertaken, a beginning was made with the later *medici* in the hope that the study of the tradition would yield valuable results for the text of Hippocrates, whose works were to be reëdited last. As the several treatises of Galen have appeared, I have examined them attentively with especial reference to this matter; but hitherto I have noted nothing to justify hopes in that direction.

The typography and proof-reading of this volume, like its predecessors, is excellent. The number of palpable errors in the text is very small; but if my test of the indices yielded a fair average the false references in them must be numerous. This is to be regretted, because the index verborum is far from complete; if it is inaccurate also, its value is greatly diminished. The enterprise of the Corpus, undertaken and bravely continued by the associated academies, is one of the most important now in progress, and deserves the interest and support of all students of classical antiquity.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

Master Walter Map's Book *De Nugis Curialium* (Courtiers' Trifles). Englished by FREDERICK TUPPER and MARBURY B. OGLE. London: Chatto & Windus, 1924. xxx + 363 pp. 25 sh.

Professors TUPPER and OGLE, of the University of Vermont, offer here an English key to that mediaeval Latin storehouse of curious facts and fancies which bears the name of 'Master Walter Map's Book *De Nugis Curialium*.' It is a very readable and, apparently, a pretty faithful rendering, though, as no one knows better than the translators, "the unriddling of Map is a fascinating but fearsome adventure." They add an excellent introduction, and some useful literary and historical notes.

A few additional notes may be suggested (with references added to the Latin text as edited by M. R. James, Oxford, 1914):

P. 15, l. 21 (J. 13, 5). Cp. Juv. vii. 33, *sed vatem egregium . . . anxietate carens animus facit*; Juv. vii. 66, *magnae mentis opus nec de lodice paranda attonitae*, etc.

P. 42, 9 (J. 33, 29). For the '*baculus in aqua fractus*,' as a type of things which are not as they seem, cp. Cic. Acad. Pr. II 25, 79 (with J. S. Reid's note); Lucr. iv. 438, etc.

P. 100, 10 (J. 80, 1). "*Pan* is interpreted all," etc. Cp. Serv. on Verg. Bucol. ii. 31.

P. 130, 24 (J. 104, 15). Cp. Juv. vii. 59, *neque enim cantare sub antro Pierio . . . potest . . . maesta paupertas*.

P. 150, 38 (J. 119, 17). Cp. Ovid, Pont. ii. 3, 53, *et bene uti pugnes, bene pugnans efficit hostis*.

P. 175, 29 (J. 137, 13). Cp. Ovid, Her. v. 129, *a iuvene et cupido credatur reddita virgo?*

P. 191, 27 (J. 152, 3). Cp. Chaucer, Merch. T. 309, "*But I woot best where wryngeth me my sho.*" Add a reference to Plutarch, Coniug. Praec. 22, and Aemil. Paul. 5. The name Sulpicius is not given by St. Jerome.

P. 229, 6 (J. 182, 22). A variant on the story of Sertorius, Valer. Max. vii. 4, 6.

P. 306, 20 (J. 244, 5). Cp. Ovid, Met. xiii. 1, *Consedere duces*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Sénèque, Dialogues. Tome II: De la vie heureuse, De la brièveté de la vie. Texte établi et traduit par A. BOURGERY. 169 pp. 9 fr. Tome III: Consolations. Texte établi et traduit par RENÉ WALTZ. 258 pp. 14 fr. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1923.

The new French series of Greek and Latin Classics ("Collection des Universités de France") grows apace. In the *De Vita Beata*, iii. 4, Professor BOURGERY prints, *nam uoluptatibus et [pro] illicitis, quae parua ac fragilia sunt et ipsis fragrantibus noxia*; at xx. 3, *Ego mortem eodem uultu quo cum audiam uidebo* ("Moi, je ferai la même figure devant la mort, que j'en entends parler ou que je la vois"). In xviii. 3, *iste* is apparently a misprint for *istis*. In the *De Brevitate Vitae*, xiv. 5, he reads, *licet dicant* ("quoi qu'on dise"), xv. 3, *bonis uero*

ad suum arbitrium nasci licet. In the *Ad Marciam*, uincet (x. 6) is a misprint for uinciet; querentur (xxii. 7) should be queruntur.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Francisci Petrarchae Epistolae Selectae. Edidit A. F. JOHNSON. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923. x + 276 pp. 8 sh. 6.

This is one of the most interesting Latin books of the year. The selection has been made with the intention of giving an account of Petrarch's life in his own words, and of introducing descriptions of historical events of which he was a spectator. The notes are mainly biographical and historical. Many of the classical allusions and quotations are explained but not all. Some additional notes may be suggested:

P. 14, 11. Cp. Cic. *Am.* iv, 15, voluntatum studiorum sententiarum summa consensio.

P. 14, 17. Vulg. 1 *Cor.* 13, 7, omnia suffert (*caritas*).

P. 14, 24. Cp. Catull. 22, 1, quem probe nosti.

P. 34, 45. Virg. *Geor.* iv. 563, dulcis . . . Parthenope.

P. 37, 5. Cic. *Deiot.* iv. 11, de salute populi Romani extimescebat, in qua etiam suam esse inclusam videbat.

P. 59, 43. Cp. Juvenal, x. 49-50, crassoque sub aëre nasci, etc.

P. 60, 17. Valer. Max. viii. 7, Ext. 6, "non essem," inquit, salvus, nisi istae perissent."

P. 65, 20. Cp. Publil. Syr., Comes facundus in via pro vehiculo est.

P. 80, 31. Juvenal, iii. 164, haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obstat res angusta domi.

P. 90, 11. Virg. *Aen.* 1, 205, sedes ubi fata quietas ostendunt.

P. 91, 36. Virg. *Aen.* xi. 550, omnia secum versanti.

P. 99, 15. Virg. *Ecl.* viii. 42, ut me malus abstulit error.

P. 100, 54. Vulg. *Psal.* 33, 17, fallax equus ad salutem.

P. 107, 4. Cp. Livy, xxx. 38, 10, aquarum insolita magnitudo in religionem versa.

P. 117, 5. Cic. *Att.* vii. 6, 1, plane deest quod ad te scribam; also, vii. 5, 4; v. 5, 1.

P. 136, 1. Virg. *Ecl.* viii. 11, A te principium, tibi desinet.

P. 142, 37. Cic. *T. D.* i. 48, 114, non nasci homini longe optimum esse, proximum autem quam primum mori.

P. 165, 190. Vulg. *Zach.* ix. 10, et loquetur pacem gentibus, et potestas eius a mari usque ad mare.

P. 192, 76. *Oic. Am.* iii. 10, mihi accidit, si quid accidit; suis autem incommotis graviter angi non amicum sed se ipsum amantis est.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Sudarė K. BŪGA. Kaunas [Kovno] 1924 [et seq.], išleido Švietimo Ministerija (Valstybės Spaustuvė).

One of the early projects of the youthful republic of Lithuania was the making of a comprehensive dictionary of its ancient but living language. This task was assigned to the Ministry of Education and the editorship of Professor Kasimir Būga, of the University of Kovno, with his associates and assistants. Būga is the leading authority in the study of his native tongue, and at the same time he is a scholar of wide experience in the Indo-European field. The appearance of the first fascicle of the new dictionary not only lays the foundation of a great monument to Lithuanian nationalism and Lithuanian scholarship, but it is also an event of prime importance to the philological world.

It would, of course, be premature to attempt a review of the dictionary, but the beginning establishes the standard, and it is full of promise. The present installment consists of lxiv plus 80 double-columned imperial 8vo pages. A proportional comparison with other dictionaries of Lithuanian indicates about 5000 pages for the completed work, which will be issued in volumes of 700 or 800 pages each. Where the corresponding pages of *Kurschat* contain about 300 title-words, the first fascicle of Būga contains about 2000, and not even the incomplete *Juškevič* approaches the Būga in the amount of information given under the various words.

The book is written and edited in the Lithuanian language, but a definition is usually taken over in the language in which it is found, Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, or German. The work is splendidly documented as to sources, and abundantly provided with illustrative quotations, chronological word-histories, and dialectic distinctions. Etymologies are given eclectic, and somewhat didactic, treatment, but the compression is no greater than is usual in the general dictionaries of other languages.

The table of abbreviations contains the most extensive Lithuanian bibliography that has yet been published. This is followed by an elaborate chapter on accent, and by an account of the Baltic peoples and their languages.

HAROLD H. BENDER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander, with an English translation by members of the Illinois Greek Club. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1923.

Albertini (Eugène). *La Composition dans les ouvrages philosophiques de Sénèque*. Paris, *E. de Boccard*, 1923. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 127.) Pp. ix + 354.

Anglicus (Bartholomew). *Mediaeval Lore from*. By Robert Steele. London, *Chatto & Windus*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xi + 195. \$1.85.

Barry (M. Inviolata). *St. Augustine, the Orator. A study of the rhetorical qualities of St. Augustine's Sermones ad populum*. A diss. Washington, D. C., *Catholic University of America*, 1924. Pp. xi + 261. (The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, Vol. VI.)

Bechtel (Friedrich). *Die griechischen Dialekte. Zweiter Band: Die westgriechischen Dialekte; Dritter Band: Der ionische Dialekt*. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1923-1924.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 2, Janvier 1924; No. 3, Avril 1924. Paris.

Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. II, Part 1. December, 1923. University of Wales. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. \$2.50.

Camp (Charles W.) *The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1924. 170 pp. \$2.00.

Cicero. *De Divinatione. Liber secundus. Part II*. With commentary by Arthur Stanley Pease. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois Press*, 1923. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 3.)

Coester (Alfred). *An Anthology of the Modernista Movement in Spanish America*. Boston, New York, *Ginn and Company*, 1924. Pp. xxxvii + 314. \$1.48.

Cooper (Lane). *The Climax*. (Reprinted from the January number of *The Sewanee Review*, 1924, pp. 1-14.)

Cuny (Albert). *Études prégrammaticales sur le domaine des langues indo-européennes et chamito-sémitiques*. Paris, *Honoré Champion*, 1924. Pp. xxxiv + 481. (Collection linguistique XIV.)

Darkó (Eugenius). *Laonici Chalcocandylae Historiarum Demonstrationes*. Tomi II. Pars Prior libros V-VII continens. Budapestini, *Sumptibus Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae*, 1923. 146 pp.

Dawson (John Charles). *Toulouse in the Renaissance*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1923. 190 pp. \$2.50.

De Ridder (A.) and Deonna (W.) *L'Art en Grèce*. Paris, *La Renaissance du Livre*, 1924. Pp. xxviii + 430, 23 plates. 20 fr. net.

Dessau (Hermann). *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. viii + 586 pp. 8°.

Dittmer (William Anthony). *The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didascaliae Found in Rome*. Princeton diss. Leiden, *H. J. Brill*, 1923. 54 pp.

Duff (J. Wight). *The Writers of Rome*. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1923. 112 pp. \$1.00.

Duhn (Friedrich von). *Italische Gräberkunde*. Erster Teil. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1924. Pp. viii + 688, 35 plates. (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 2.)

Dunlap (James E.) *The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the later Roman and Byzantine Empires*. New York and London, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. Pp. viii, 165-324. \$1.00 net. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, XIV, II.)

Essays and Studies by members of the English Association. Vol. IX collected by the late W. P. Ker. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1924. 144 pp.

Euripide. Tome III. Texte établi et traduit par Léon Parmentier et Henri Grégoire. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres"*, 1923. Pp. iv + 247 (duplicate numbering).

Glasgow (George). *The Janina Murders and the Occupation of Corfu*. London, *The Anglo-Hellenic League*, 1923. 24 pp.

Götze (Albrecht). *Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit*. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1924. 32 pp.

Grandgent (Charles H.) *Discourses on Dante*. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1924. Pp. vi + 201. \$2.25.

Greek Review. April, 1924. Chicago, *The "Greek Review" Publishing Co.*

Haverfield (F.) *The Roman Occupation of Britain, being six Ford lectures, now revised by George Macdonald*. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. 304 pp. \$6.00.

Herodotus, with an English translation. By A. D. Godley. Vol. IV. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.) \$2.50.

Hespéris. *Archives berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des Hautes-Études marocaines*. Année 1923. 3^e trimestre. Paris, *Larose*.

Hiestand (Max). *Das sokratische Nichtwissen in Platons ersten Dialogen*. Zürich, *Seldwyla*, 1923. 110 pp.

Hippocrates, with an English translation. By W. H. S. Jones. Vol. II. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1923. (Loeb Classical Library.)

Hirst (Gertrude). An Attempt to Date the Composition of Aeneid VII. (Reprinted from *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2, 1916.) Pp. 10.

Howald (Ernst). Platon's Leben. Zürich, *Seldwyla*, 1923. 109 pp.

Inter-América. English: Volume VII, No. 4, April, 1924. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Company*.

Journal of Education and The School World. February, March, April, May, 1924. London, *William Rice*.

Julian, The Works of the Emperor. With an English translation by Wilmer Cave Wright. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1923. (Loeb Classical Library.)

Layamon's Brut. Selections, edited with introduction, notes and glossary by Joseph Hall. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xx + 150. \$2.20.

Leaf (Walter). Strabo on the Troad, Book XIII, Cap. I. Edited with translation and commentary. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1923. Pp. xlviii + 352. 25 sh. net.

Lehman (Linwood). Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress, especially in Plautus and Terence. *University of Virginia*, 1924. 81 pp.

Livy, with an English Translation. By B. O. Foster. Vol. III. Books V, VI and VII. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.) \$2.50.

Lorimer (W. L.) The Text Tradition of Pseudo-Aristotle 'De Mundo' together with an appendix containing the text of the Medieval Latin versions. London, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XVIII.)

Lyra Graeca. Newly edited and translated by J. M. Edmonds. Vol. II. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.) \$2.50.

Macdonell (Arthur Anthony). A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary with transliteration, accentuation, and etymological analysis throughout. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1924. Pp. xii + 382. \$10.00.

Meecham (Henry G.) Light from Ancient Letters. Private correspondence in the non-literary papyri of Oxyrhynchus of the first four centuries and its bearing on New Testament language and thought. London, *George Allen & Unwin Ltd.*; New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1923. 189 pp.

Merrill (William A.) The Characteristics of Lucretius' Verse and Lucubrations Lucretianae. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1924. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 7, Nos. 7 and 8, pp. 221-267.)

Mey (Carmelo Viñas). Una pagina para la historia del Helenismo en España. (De la Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos.) Madrid, *Rev. de Arch., Bibl. y Museos*, 1922. 86 pp.

Monnier (Henri). Les nouvelles de Léon le Sage. Bordeaux, *Feret & Fils*; Paris, *E. de Boccard*, 1923. Pp. vii + 226. (Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi, Fasc. XVII.)

The Nun's Rule, being the Ancren Riwe modernised by James Morton with introduction by Abbot Gasquet. London, *Chatto & Windus*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xxvii + 339. \$1.85.

Oldfather (Charles Henry). The Greek Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt. A study in the history of civilization. Madison, 1923. Pp. viii + 104. (University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, No. 9.)

Ovide. L'art d'aimer. Texte établi et traduit par Henri Bornecque. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Pp. ix + 94 (duplicate numbering).

Pascal (Carlo). Le credenze d'oltretomba nelle opere letterarie dell' antichità classica. 2 vols. Torino, Milano, *G. B. Paravia & C.*

Personalist (The). Vol. V, No. 2. April 1924. Los Angeles, *University of Southern California*.

Phèdre. Fables. Texte établi et traduit par Alice Brenot. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Pp. xvi + 113 (duplicate numbering).

Philological Quarterly, Vol. III, April 1924, No. 2. Published at the *University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa.

Platon. Oeuvres complètes. Tome VIII, 2^e partie. Théétète. Texte établi et traduit par Auguste Diès. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Pp. 119-155 + 156-263 (duplicate numbering).

Plautus, with an English translation. By Paul Nixon. Vol. III. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.) \$2.50.

Plotin. Ennéades I. Texte établi et traduit par Émile Bréhier. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Pp. xlv + 132 (duplicate numbering).

Priyadarśikā, a Sanskrit Drama by Harsha. Translated into English by G. K. Nariman, A. V. Williams Jackson, and Charles J. Ogden. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1923. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. 10.) Pp. cxi + 137. \$2.00.

Purdie (Edna). Von deutscher Art und Kunst. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. 196 pp. \$1.70.

Recueil des historiens de la France. T. IV: Obituaires de la province de Sens; T. VIII: Pouillés des provinces d'Aix, d'Arles, et d'Embrun. Paris, *Imprimerie Nationale*, 1923.

Rivista di archeologia cristiana della Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra. Milano, Roma, *Bestetti & Tumminelli*, 1923.

Robertson (J. G.) Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1923. Pp. vi + 298. 12s. 6d. net.

Robertson (H. Grant). The Administration of Justice in the Athenian Empire. *University of Toronto Library*, 1924. (University of Toronto Studies, History and Economics, Vol. IV, No. 1.)

Robin (Léon). La pensée grecque et les origines de l'esprit scientifique. Paris, *La Renaissance du Livre*, 1923. Pp. xxi + 480. 15 fr. net.

Rostagni (Augusto). Il Verbo di Pitagora. Torino, *Fratelli Bocca*, 1924. 302 pp.

Saint Boniface, the English Correspondence of: being for the most part letters exchanged between the apostle of the Germans and his English friends: translated and edited with an introductory sketch of

the saint's life by Edward Kylie. London, *Chatto & Windus*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 212. \$1.85.

Schmitt (Alfred). *Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Akzentlehre*. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1924. xv + 209.

Secord (Arthur Wellesley). *Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe*. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois Press*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. IX, No. 1, February 1924.)

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 80. *Mandan and Hidatsa Music*. By Frances Densmore. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1923. Pp. xx + 192.

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 81. *Excavations in the Chama Valley, New Mexico*. By J. A. Jeancon. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1923. Pp. iv + 80.

Society for Pure English. Tract No. XVI. *Logic and Grammar*, by Otto Jespersen; *Great and Little Britain*, by D. MacRitchie and W. H. Stevenson. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1924.

Sophocle. Tome II. *Les Trachiniennes, Philoctète, Oedipe à Colone, Les Limiers*. Texte établi et traduit par Paul Masqueray. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. 250 pp. (duplicate numbering).

Stanley (Albert A.) *Greek Themes in Modern Musical Settings*. New York and London, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. Pp. xxii + 385. \$4.00 net.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vol. I, Fasc. II. *Lugduni Batavorum*, A. W. Sijthoff, 1924. Pp. 69-136. 8°.

Sweet (Henry). *A Short Historical English Grammar*. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. xii + 264. \$1.50.

Swoboda (Heinrich). *Zwei Kapitel aus dem griechischen Bundesrecht*. Wein und Leipzig, *Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky A.-G.* 1924. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, *Sitzungsberichte*, 199. Bd., 2. Abhandlung.)

Täubler (Eugen). *Bellum Helveticum. Eine Caesar-Studie*. Zürich, *Seldwyla*, 1924. 167 pp.

Thucydides, with an English translation. By Charles Forster Smith. Vol. IV. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1923. (Loeb Classical Library.)

Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum. Texte établi et traduit par Max Ponchont. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Pp. xlv + 195.

Ungarische Jahrbücher. Berlin und Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.* Bd. III, Hft. 3-4, November and December 1923.

Van Deman (Esther Boise). *The Neronian Sacra Via*. (Reprinted from the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Second Series, Vol. XXVII (1923), No. 4.) Pp. 383-424.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Translated by Charles J. Billson. New and revised edition. New York, *D. Appleton and Co.*, 1924. Pp. viii + 365.

Vrind (Gerard). *De Cassii Dionis vocabulis quae ad ius publicum*

pertinent. Inaug.-diss. Hagae Comitibus, *Bernard Mensing*, 1923. Pp. viii + 173.

Wardale (E. E.) *An Old English Grammar*. New York, *E. P. Dutton and Company*. Pp. ix + 131.

Weber (Shirley Howard). *Anthimus, De Observatione Ciborum*. Text, Commentary, and Glossary, with a study of the Latinity. Princeton diss. Leiden, *E. J. Brill, Ltd.*, 1924. 152 pp.

Wells (Henry W.) *Poetic Imagery illustrated from Elizabethan literature*. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1924. 231 pp. \$1.75.

West (Allen B.) *The Early Diplomacy of Philip II of Macedon. Illustrated by his Coins*. (Reprinted from the 'Numismatic Chronicle' Fifth Series, Vol. III.) 1923. 42 pp.

Wright (Joseph) and Wright (Elizabeth Mary). *An Elementary Middle English Grammar*. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1923. Pp. xi + 214. \$2.35.

Year's Work in English Studies (The). 1922. Edited for The English Association by Sir Sidney Lee and F. S. Boas. London and New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1923. 220 pp. \$2.50.

Xenophon. *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, with an English translation. By E. C. Marchant. London, *Wm. Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1923. (Loeb Classical Library.)

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLV, 3

WHOLE No. 179

I.—VERGIL'S MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS.

Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue* has had a most interesting fate. Though its author announced his purpose to sound a higher note (*paulo maiora canamus*), he had in mind the comparison with his strictly bucolic verse, and little dreamed that his song would in time to come be bracketed with the angelic song heard by shepherds guarding their flocks by night on the hills above Bethlehem. Even less did he dream that his song would be quoted at an ecumenical council of adherents of a religion destined in time to have one of its chief centers in Rome, or that it would procure for him the character of its prophet and the honor of serving as guide among the dead for its greatest poet. A poem destined to have such a career has of course excited extraordinary interest: the literature which it has called forth is voluminous and includes many works by eminent scholars. Not the least of these is Eduard Norden's *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1924). The present article is occasioned by the appearance of this book, but can hardly be called a review of it, because a review would require one to touch upon many points which must here be passed over. It is to be hoped and expected that these other matters will be discussed by one or another of the reviewers, of whom there will surely be no lack.

My purpose is to consider several important questions raised by Norden's book, which my own studies give promise of presenting in a new and different light, and to make some contribution of my own toward an understanding of the historical problem, without referring at every point to Norden's discussion or seeking to distinguish sharply between my views and his,

presupposing that my readers will have read and duly weighed his argument. Nevertheless, I am unwilling to forego the pleasure of signaling the great merits of a book which deserves and will surely receive unstinted praise from every scholar who reads it.

Everyone who is familiar with the previous works of Professor Norden could easily have guessed wherein the chief value of his study would be found to lie; for he has proved himself an adept in the philologist's art of nice and exact interpretation of texts and an accomplished critic of literary form and tone. If his reviewers should be able to discover serious flaws in *Die Geburt des Kindes*, when considered from these points of view, it would greatly surprise me; for, with the exception of a few points, where I was inclined to question but distrusted my judgment quite as much as his, I noted nothing to criticize. The book, moreover, has a positive merit beyond that of exhibiting the virtues of the accomplished philologist and critic: the charm of its author's style and the contagious warmth of his emotional response to his lofty theme and its time-honored associations lift the reader at times into a sphere far above mere scholarship. It is a book as well as a study.

Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue* furnishes the text to be interpreted and therefore to a certain extent defines the scope of Norden's study, which is essentially a scholion writ large. Now it is in the nature of the scholion that it should be written *ad hoc*. So far as the analysis and strictly philological interpretation of the text is concerned, this origin of the book is wholly to its advantage; but its author shows by the title he has chosen—*Die Geburt des Kindes*—and by the method which he adopts throughout that he is chiefly concerned to trace a tradition to its origins. Regarding the nature of this tradition, one suspects, Professor Norden had not arrived at a perfectly clear conception. An element of permanence is of the essence of a tradition; and in anything which owes its origin and perpetuation to the social nature of man it is not the specific content but the general scheme and form that endures. Norden is conscious of this fact and emphasizes it; but, true to his antecedents, it is almost exclusively the literary form—or formula—to which he looks for the clew. One need not deny the relevancy of such evidence,

where it can be found, to the questions at issue; but every student of human society is well aware that literature—even the religious formula—is a fleeting phenomenon in comparison with other social forms. Institutions (customs, observances, rites) abide when the thought and even the spoken or written formula have become obsolete and lost in oblivion. It is in his effort to trace the tradition embodied in Vergil's *Eclogue* to its origins that Norden shows the inadequacy of his knowledge and method. What the author of *Περὶ ὕψους* says of literary criticism—*ἡ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κρίσις πολλῆς ἐστὶ πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγένημα*—applies with even greater force to historical criticism; for, though it is conceivable that one might be endowed by nature with a judgment in matters of style so nice as to be well-nigh infallible, no one is born with a knowledge of facts such as are requisite to the determination of obscure questions of history. Historical judgment and insight are to be achieved if at all only by long and painstaking study superadded to natural endowment of no ordinary sort. Above all things an important contribution to the history of ideas is not likely to result from a special study of a given theme—a work *ad hoc*; it is more probably to be expected from an apparently chance insight for which long consideration of many related matters has prepared the way.

In thus characterizing Norden's study as an *opus ad hoc* rather than *πολλῆς πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγένημα*, it is not my intention to stigmatize it as in the ordinary sense uncritical or ill informed. Quite the reverse: the author has read a good deal of the literature that has gathered round his theme and has profited in more than one direction by the counsel and guidance of eminent specialists, a privilege for which a scholar less fortunately situated might well envy him. Nevertheless, eminent specialists may sometimes lead one astray, as when Norden's mentors in Egyptology aided and abetted him in his mistaken tendency to father upon Egypt the entire tradition regarding the *Αἰών* and the divine child. Of this more must be said in the sequel; at present the important point is that this special course of reading has led Norden neither into really new fields, from which he might have gathered decisive facts bearing upon the disputed questions, nor into a high mountain from

which he might have surveyed all the fields, new and old, and coördinated the data collected by specialist pioneers.

So much premised, let us proceed to consider a few of the questions which naturally suggest themselves to the reader of Norden's work. The first, indeed the all-important, question relates to the occasion of Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*. We know that the poem was addressed to Pollio on the occasion of his inauguration as consul in 40 B. C. The poem itself shows that Vergil's Messianic expectations were connected with that event. The question, which no one to my knowledge has answered, is why "the hopes and fears of all the years" (to quote the Nativity hymn of Phillips Brooks) were met in Rome that night. Norden has of course raised this question, but has given it a mistaken turn by asking why the Sibyl dated the reign of Helios and the beginning of the new Aeon in the year 40 B. C. The obvious retort is that she did not. As Heraclitus said, "the lord whose is the oracle at Delphi neither utters nor hides his meaning, but shows it by a sign." It was even so with the Sibyl; whatever she said—and we do not know just what she said—we may be sure that she indicated the time by some of the customary signs of the end, which had to be interpreted and referred to a particular time. We have therefore to ask why Vergil, and doubtless others with him, came to expect the critical juncture at that precise time, invoking the prophecy of the Cumaean Sibyl.

Norden has well shown that Vergil's poem was intended to be presented to Pollio on the occasion of his inauguration as consul on New Year's day, 40 B. C. It was doubtless composed shortly before that date, on which the old world was to pass away and the new Aeon, beginning under the reign of Helios-Apollo, should restore the golden age of Saturn. Coincident with the new Aeon should come a heaven-descended child, the first-born of many brethren, a new and better race of men. The reign of Helios is probably correctly dated from the *natalis solis*, December 25, and the beginning of the new age, coinciding with the birth of the divine child, on January 6, the *γενέθλια Αἰῶνος*. Of these dates we shall presently have more to say: for the moment it will suffice to point out that both were New Year's days. When one recalls that January 1, falling about midway

between them, was likewise a New Year's day, this redundancy may seem at first surprising and even disconcerting; but those who are familiar with the even greater diversity of New Year epochs in use in Christian lands down to comparatively recent times, and reflect on the variety and number of civilizations that met and merged in ancient Rome, will have no difficulty in comprehending the situation. The Julian reform, extended some years later to Egypt, abated the confusion somewhat in civil affairs, but in religious observances—which are here chiefly in question—the ancient practices continued. In Rome itself the *calendae Martiae* held their place for centuries alongside the *calendae Januariae*.

Though Norden has not pushed his inquiries very far, he does not fail to see that the question regarding the end of one Aeon and the beginning of another is connected both with the calendar and with astrology, or, if one prefers, with astronomy. The Aeon assumes so great an importance in ancient thought just because *time* is so important a factor in ancient religion. One has only to think of the Hebrews' observance of times and seasons to become convinced that their *mo'adim* were the *sacra par excellence* of their religion: though they can be shown to have changed, these appointed seasons have changed less in the course of history than any other factor in their religious life. A comparison of Ar. *Nubes* 615 sq., *Pax* 414 sq., with the Jewish *Book of Jubilees* 6, 32-38 will show at once that Jew and Greek were essentially at one in their feeling, and that both were equally concerned about the calendar. The calendar is of course primarily a religious institution, and even Julius Caesar, when he reformed it, was careful to avoid any dislocation of festivals, preserving with truly religious care the very numbering of every *dies festus*.

If time was all-important, the luminaries which measure time are no less important. The Psalmist says, "He appointed the moon for seasons; the sun knoweth his going down" (which marked the beginning of the sacral day). Sun and moon are indeed the hands of the clock: they are superimposed at twelve o'clock, when they have completed the circuit of the dial. Possibly man may have measured time at first solely by the apparent diurnal revolution of the sun; but among the most primitive

peoples known to us the lunation, as well as the day, is known and religiously observed. The close of the lunation with the ominous days of the dark of the moon presumably furnished the original model for "the last days" of eschatology, when men apprehended the possibility that time should be no more. The crisis, observed with dark rites, once passed, the new moon—herald of a new cycle—was hailed with ecstatic joy. In more highly civilized societies the fateful moment of the possible stoppage of the wheel of time is expected when it reaches, so to speak, a dead center, as several cycles are simultaneously completed. Since the year consisted of an integral number of days and months, and intercalation generally took the form of the occasional or periodic insertion of a whole month, such a crisis recurred at the expiry of every year. The turn of the year was, therefore, a moment when the end of the world might always be expected, and it was marked by certain *rites de passage*, or passovers, intended to prevent the stoppage of the wheel of time. One might cite a long list of rites, now surviving chiefly in the rudimentary form of children's games, which once served magically to keep the wheel in motion, as it threatened to halt at a dead center. As astronomy took cognizance of more and more indicators of time, the calculation became increasingly refined, yielding, besides the solar, sidereal, "great," or Platonic years, to be punctuated by an *ἐκπύρωσις* or other catastrophe. But each refinement in the measurement of time brought with it a practical or theoretical rectification of the calendar: in other words, it called for a more elaborate scheme of intercalation, by which the practical time-pieces employed by man were corrected to coincide with the heavenly clock.

Ancient mythology and legend preserve far more references to this process than are commonly recognized. Cornford, in his contribution to Miss Harrison's *Themis*, was quite right in connecting the feast of Thyestes and the attendant reversal of the sun's course with the Kronia (the *Saturnalia regna*) and the practice of periodic intercalation. Plato, *Polit.* 269 sq., not obscurely suggests the same connection. The myth is regularly associated with a change of dynasty. It is, moreover, unquestionably to be connected, by whatever intermediate links, with the reversal of the sun's course reported in the lapse of Egyptian

history by Herodotus 2. 142, 144, as Campbell has pointed out. In the latter passage it is assumed that no such catastrophes as the flood of Deucalion or the ἐκπύρωσις of Phaethon, which visited other lands, afflicted Egypt,¹ where—Egyptologists assure us—there was no myth of the Flood. To the same category belong the behavior of the sun and moon on the occasion of Joshua's victory over the five Amorite Kings at Gibeon, and the return of the shadow ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz in the days of Hezekiah. Diels, *Antike Technik*,² p. 156, n. 2, has with great probability explained the latter as referring to a form of the sun-dial found in Egypt; but he failed to see the reference to the practice of intercalation. It would carry us too far afield to enlarge upon this subject at present; but one who will consider the myths of Tantalus, Thyestes, Oenomaus, and Pelops, in relation to the conception of the new Aeon and the birth of the new divine king, will readily convince himself that there is a real connection between them.

Time, of course, begins with creation; and creation, of course, begins on New Year's day of the first year. In the biblical account creation is completed on the sixth day with the creation of man. To the anthropocentric thought of the ancients, however, the creation of man is the real beginning. We thus have two New Year epochs separated by an interval of five days. Of this we shall have more to say presently. Before creation lies chaos, and each completed cycle returns full circle to the beginning; therefore there is chaos and imminent dissolution before each new revolution. The death of one Aeon is the birth of its successor, both occurring—to use a phrase of Lucretius—*tempore puncto*. This is the reason why, *e. g.*, in Jewish eschatology, the distinction between “the last days” and the beginning of the new Messianic kingdom is difficult, or rather impossible. All the “signs” which attended creation are expected to recur at the end of the times. Gunkel well expressed the fact in the title of his excellent book, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. When these signs of the end appear, men begin to watch and pray. New Year's Eve has been a time of vigil and supplication from time immemorial. Historians and theo-

¹ See Augustine (Patr. Lat.), 41, 568.

logians are continually laying a false emphasis upon the supposed distress of the last days, and Norden is perplexed to find that at the moment when Vergil expected the birth of the divine child and the new Aeon there were neither wars nor rumors of war, but it was a time of peace.^{1a} One who knows his *Oedipus Rex* and the countless aetiological myths told to account for religious rites will understand that the plagues are not to be taken too literally. Consider the occasions for worship enumerated by Solomon in his prayer for the dedication of his temple.

The astrologers cast the nativity of the world as they did the horoscope of a child. In the beginning they read the end. Hence Roman emperors forbade the casting of nativities—unless they were favorable for themselves. As the first creation had its Adam, each new age was expected to have its new Adam, whose horoscope was that of the age. Both would come in the fulness of time. But who should know the times and seasons? That was the business of the prophet, in Egypt as in Israel. The Psalmist complains (74. 9), “We see not our signs: there is no more any prophet, neither is there among us any that knoweth how long.” From first to last the Hebrew prophets have one theme—the day of Jehovah, the day at once of doom and of salvation. What seems to have been overlooked, or but dimly discerned by the theologians, is that the messages—the threats and promises, the curses and blessings—of the prophets of Israel one and all borrow the colors, in which they depict the day of decision, from the hopes and fears of the pilgrimage festivals. But of these festivals we shall have to speak more at length presently.

It does not follow that all prophets were in the strict sense astrologers; but they were all supposed to be able to read the signs of the times. At the end of the times, as we know from the Gospels, false prophets will abound. Christians were warned against heeding them. “And being asked by the Pharisees,

^{1a} The Christian Fathers likewise were troubled by the fact that the birth of Christ fell in a time of peace. See *Patr. Lat.*, 17, 608-9; 120, 122.

when the kingdom of God cometh, [Jesus] answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or there! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you" (*Luke* 17. 20-21). Nevertheless, Jews and Christians alike expected a great prophet—chiefly Elijah—in the last days. Though the rôle of astrology was not great among the earlier Jews, who knew little of science in any form, Jewish conceptions were dominated by the same thoughts which among other peoples were more precisely formulated, as among the Magi and the Egyptians.

These considerations suggest the true explanation of the expectations regarding the beginning of the new Aeon which found expression in Vergil's Messianic *Eclogue*. Norden points out (p. 31) that the astrological conception of the Aeon was familiar at Rome in the days of Sulla and Caesar. There can be no doubt that it was the serious derangement of the Roman calendar that led men at that time to occupy their minds with such matters. In 46 B. C. Caesar reformed the calendar, inaugurating a new era. Many indications, which it would take too much space here to consider in detail, suggest that Caesar himself and the intellectual circles at Rome (chiefly devoted to the cause of the Republic) had in mind the complex of ideas associated with the crisis in the affairs of men to be expected at such a juncture. Certainly Augustus, if not Caesar, became the center of Messianic hopes with all the embellishment of legend inevitable under the circumstances, as Deonna has well shown. So great was the disagreement of the calendar with real time that the adjustment had to be made piecemeal, allowing a last year of great confusion. Even then Caesar did not venture to indicate when the final readjustment should be made, which would of course come with the first intercalation under the new calendar. Why he did not do so must remain a matter of conjecture: it may have been want of precise astrological or astronomical knowledge, or it may have been policy dictated by considerations connected with the beginning of the new Aeon. Our sources seem to have taken a very matter of fact view of the question, saying that the intercalation should take place after four years; but this merely reflects the ordinary practice, once the final

adjustment was made.² At all events Caesar wisely left the determination to the pontifices: he did not live to see the correction made, which accordingly occurred at the close of the year 41 B. C., ostensibly to avoid the coincidence of January 1, 40 B. C. with a market day (Dio Cassius, 48. 33). The very day, therefore, on which Pollio began his consulship and Vergil expected the new Aeon with its attendant blessings, was the one for which, supposedly, the final correction of the Julian era was effected.

One might cite much evidence from various sources in support of this explanation; but I will confine myself to a work with which Norden shows no acquaintance. Though it abounds in things of extraordinary interest, as will be seen by references in the sequel, it seems to be but superficially known even to the more serious students of ancient chronology. I refer to *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* of Al-Biruni, translated by Sachau (London, 1879). Its author, a Persian adherent of Islam, wrote about the year 1000 of our era, and had a very precise knowledge of many matters of the greatest importance touching the calendar and calendary festivals. In particular he shows an acquaintance with the astrological tradition still vital in his time among the peoples who longest retained their ancient devotion to the subject. Hence his book contains many valuable hints for the student, who will be able to gather the same information elsewhere only by the most careful study and inference.

Zoroaster, as all men know, was reputed the founder of a new religion and of a new era. Now, a new religion naturally marks an epoch, which will as naturally be dated at New Year. Thus Al-Biruni says (p. 200): "One Persian scholar adduces as reason why this day (the Persian New Year) was called Naurôz, the following: viz. that the Sabians arose during the reign of Tahmurath. When, then, Jamshid succeeded, he renovated the religion, and his work, the date of which was Naurôz, was called *New Day*. Then it was made a feast day, having

² In fact, this does not apply, because the Julian calendar was put into effect on March 1, 45 B. C.; moreover, the regular intercalation was no doubt intended to be made, as before, not in December, but in February.

already before been held in great veneration." This was of course long before Zoroaster. Regarding the latter Al-Biruni says (p. 17): "The Persians and Magians think that the duration of the world is 12,000 years . . . and that Zoroaster, the founder of their law, thought that of these there had passed till the time of his appearance, 3000 years, *intercalated with the day-quarters; for he himself had made their computations, and had taken into account that defect, which had accrued to them on account of the day-quarters, till the time when they were intercalated and were made to agree with real time.*³ From his appearance [an Epiphany?] till the beginning of the Aera Alexandri they count 258 years; therefore they count from the beginning of the world till Alexander 3258 years. However,⁴ if we compute the years from the creation of Gayômarth, whom they count to be the first man, and sum up the years of the reign of each of his successors—for the rule (of Iran) remained with his descendants without interruption—this number is, for the time till Alexander, the sum total of 3354 years. So the specification of the single items of the addition does not agree with the sum total." One sees here the chronologist's effort to fix with absolute precision the beginning of an era in terms of whole years, corrected by intercalation to agree with real time. What Al-Biruni elsewhere (pp. 32, 86) tells us about the era of Alexander is equally interesting; for the Jews, he says, reckoned this data as precisely 1000 years "corrected" (by intercalation) after Moses, i. e. after the exodus.

To the Moslem, of course, the era of the Hejira was of supreme importance. How definitely that was determined by the chronologists may readily be seen by consulting the hand-books,—e. g., Ginzler, 1, pp. 258 sq., though our authorities hardly realize the true nature of the available data. Here, however, we are concerned with a special point and must ignore other questions, which would too much complicate the argument, and return to Al-Biruni. Speaking of the earlier irregular use of

³ The italics are mine. P. 55 he says: "When Zoroaster arose and intercalated the years with the months, which up to that time had summed up from the day-quarters, time returned to its original condition."

⁴ This is Al-Biruni's criticism of the Persian tradition.

intercalation on the part of the Arabs before Islam he says (p. 74): "This went on till the time when the Prophet fled from Makka to Madîna, when the turn of intercalation, as we have mentioned, had come to Sha'bân [the 8th month]. Now this month was called Muharram [the 1st month], and Ramadan [the 9th month] was called Safar [the 2d month]. Then the Prophet waited till the "*farewell pilgrimage*,"⁵ on which occasion he addressed the people and said: 'The season, the time has gone round as it was on the day of God's creating the heavens and the earth' (*Sura ix. 38*). By which he meant that the months had returned to their original places, and that they had been freed from what the Arabs [before Islam] used to do with them. Therefore, the "*farewell pilgrimage*" was also called "*the correct pilgrimage*." Thereupon intercalation was prohibited and altogether neglected." Regarded as a statement of historical fact this is demonstrably untrue; for the era of the Hejira was not fixed until some time after Mohammed's death: indeed even the statements of Mohammedan authorities that this was done by Omar in the 17th year after the Flight is subject to grave doubt, though it is at present generally accepted. But Al-Biruni's report is of the greatest significance as revealing the complex of conceptions connected with the determination of a new era, particularly one depending on a renewed world under the guidance of a new religion. The clock shows the very time, to a day, of the creation, but it requires correction by intercalation. Since in Islam Mohammed is regarded as "the seal of the

⁵ This is a transparent fiction. The purpose of connecting Mohammed's Flight with the annual pilgrimage is merely to refer it to the beginning of the year; for the Arabs' hajj, like the Hebrews' *hag*, was of course a New Year's festival. The process is precisely like that of the Hebrew account of the exodus or hasty flight of the Israelites from Egypt. As the exodus began on New Year's day at the Egyptian Passover, and ended with Joshua's passover of the Jordan, accomplished "on the tenth day of the first month" (*Joshua 4. 19*), so Mohammed began his Flight at the New Year *hajj* and completed it when the Jews of Medinah were observing the Day of Atonement (the 10th Tishri, the 1st month of the so-called civil year). The correspondence even to the day and hour can be traced in the Mohammedan tradition, which is a most elaborate construct hardly to be attributed to the simple Arabs of Omar's day.

prophets," with none to come after him, there will be no new era; consequently henceforth intercalation is prohibited and among Mohammedans, who employ a pure lunar year, is altogether neglected. Among Christians, who expect a second advent, it is not so; hence a Christian poet may sing

"For lo! the days are hastening on
By prophet-bards foretold,
When with the ever-circling years
Comes round the age of gold."

The Gospels contain few hints of such beliefs among the Christians of the first generations, but the Fathers, chiefly those of the East, were steeped in them; and from them the tradition flows which even yet echoes in the Christmas carols.

We seem, then, to have discovered the reasons which led Vergil to expect that the wheel of time would begin a new revolution on January 1, 40 B. C.; but we have not been able to reconstruct the Sibylline oracle which he cites, except so far as the context of his poem may be assumed to have had its counterpart therein. In a matter of this sort, however, it is idle to speculate; for, even if the oracle merely foretold that when such and such conditions, which obtained in the beginning, were repeated, the critical time would be at hand, Vergil, knowing from other sources the expected course of events, could supply them without regard to the Sibyl. Any one who is at all familiar with the thought of that time knows that of such sources there was great abundance. With this knowledge we must, at least for the present, content ourselves.

A series of very interesting questions, however, connects itself with the precise time of the world's expected renewal. Vergil's poem, as we have already remarked, was to be presented to Pollio upon his inauguration as consul on January 1, 40 B. C., the day when, with precise correction by intercalation, the year would start exactly "on time." Just where the intercalary day was inserted is not known, but one may venture the guess that it was a *bissexтус*, interposed between December 26 and 27. Further grounds for this conjecture will presently suggest themselves to the reader, and need not be here set forth; let me content myself with calling attention to the *bissexтус* in February, in use even before the Julian reform of the calendar,

and still employed, chiefly as an unmeaning term, our manner of numbering days having changed. However that may be, the expected intercalation would of course be known to the people of Rome not later than the calends of December, when the announcement would be made by the pontifices. This would give ample time for the composition of the *Eclogue*, and may with reasonable probability be assumed as its *terminus post quem*.

A larger and more important question relates to the precise time when the Aeon and the divine child should, according to expectation, be born. Norden, as we have seen, dates the reign of Helios-Apollo from December 25 and the birth of the Aeon and of the child on January 6. Regarding these dates he has given some valuable information, but especially from the latter date he draws unwarranted conclusions, because he is too little acquainted with ancient calendars. He infers that the entire tradition regarding the Aeon derives from Egypt, where he has indeed found significant data. The matters of which I now proceed to speak have occupied my thought for ten years and are the subject of an extensive study now nearly completed. I can here give but a few of the results of my researches, the publication of which in detail I have neither the desire nor the right to anticipate, but it appears desirable to say enough to warn hasty readers of Norden's book against accepting his far-reaching conclusions.

Of December 25, it is not necessary to speak at length, because the numerous studies in recent times devoted to the antecedents of Christmas have already furnished sufficient data,⁶ and Norden does not attempt to connect this date with Egypt; but it is otherwise with January 6, to which therefore I will chiefly direct attention. Now both these dates are of course New Year's days: so much must be apparent to everyone who has at all

⁶ One interesting datum seems to have been generally overlooked. Al-Biruni, p. 316, speaking of the Sabians, says: "According to Abulfarag Alzanjani they celebrate on the 24th of this month [Hilal Kanum I = December] the feast of the Nativity." He also says (p. 318) that their year began with the winter solstice. Since, according to his report, their religion was, like that of the Samaritans, a mixture of the Jewish and the Magians', it is probable that by the Nativity is meant the *natalis Solis*.

considered the question, and speaking specifically of January 6, at Alexandria, this has been already recognized by Boll and Weinreich. If one regards this fact by itself it may appear to be merely a curious datum, explicable solely as incident to the transfer of dates from one calendar to another; but a wider survey will show that it is not so, and that the grounds on which it is specifically referred to Egypt require to be carefully reconsidered.

From what has been already said it must be clear that among the peoples who entertained such hopes and fears the New Year epoch was fraught with the most solemn associations. Indeed, one might almost write the history of the religions of those peoples who dwelt in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin by tracing the development of the rites and thoughts connected with their New Year festivals,—if only the indispensable prerequisite, the evidence for dating the documents, were not unfortunately wanting. Nevertheless, though a *vera historia* cannot be reconstructed, the evidence quite suffices to prove a far-reaching agreement both in the rites and in the thoughts which they suggested to the adherents of the several important religions. The few illustrations which follow, taken from the large number which might be cited, may serve to indicate what a comprehensive survey would show.

To begin with the Jews: though they divided their sacred history into a larger number of eras, two stood out most prominently as they considered the past,—the era of creation, and the era of Moses or of the exodus; when they considered the future, in their eschatology, their redemption and the coming of Messiah occupied their thoughts. Consequently these points of time, the beginning of the human race or the beginning of their religious and national history, on the one hand, and on the other the end of all things, framed their thoughts regarding the whence and whither of man. Creation, of course, was “in the beginning,” and beginning and end coincided. Let me quote from the Talmudic tract on the New Year: ‘Rabbi Eliezer says: ‘In Tishri the world was created . . . in Nisan our ancestors were redeemed from Egypt, and in Tishri we shall again

¹ *Rosh ha-Shanah*, p. 16 tr. Rodkinson.

be redeemed.' Rabbi Joshua says: 'In Nisan the world was created . . . On New Year's day the bondage of our fathers in Egypt ceased. In Nisan our ancestors were redeemed from Egypt, and in the same month we shall again be redeemed.' " The apparent difference of opinion between the Rabbis is immaterial, because the Jews had two epochs of the year, in Nisan and Tishri respectively; whence either might be taken as the beginning. In these months fell their chief festivals: Passover in Nisan; New Year's day, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles in Tishri. Moreover, both 'Nisan' and 'Tishri' were interpreted as meaning 'beginning.' Alongside this pronouncement of the Rabbis place the grandiose recital of the Passover ritual in which all the wonderful works of God in the past are referred to the Passover in Egypt, and the promises of redemption are referred to the Passover to come. Now all these points of time are really New Year's days.

This calls for a brief explanation, though it is impossible here to do more than state dogmatically the conclusions reached after long study. New Year's day (Rosh ha-Shanah), falling on Tishri 1, is admittedly of postexilic origin. The Day of Atonement, on Tishri 10, is the beginning of the Jubilee Year, and its character as a New Year's day has never been lost to the consciousness of the Jews. Why two such days should succeed one another after an interval of nine days, no one can now say, though various conjectures have been offered to explain the fact.⁸ All that we know is that during the exile the Jewish calendar fell, or had fallen, nine days behind the Babylonian; for *Ezekiel* (40. 1) tells us that New Year fell on the 10th of the (Babylonian) month. Now, both the Feast of Tabernacles and Passover, which are beyond question New Year's festivals antedating the exile, are dated on the 15th days respectively of Tishri and Nisan: it is obvious, for reasons which will presently suggest themselves as we consider the New Year's festivals of neighboring peoples, that these dates were fixed, during or after

⁸ To me the most probable explanation seems the neglect of intercalation. In all scientific matters the Hebrews were backward. They borrowed their calendar, and with it their festivals; but when cut off from intercourse with their more advanced neighbors, they would succeed as little as the Arabs in regulating their calendar.

the exile, with reference to the reconstructed Jewish calendar disclosed by the statement of Ezekiel, for both these festivals begin on sixth days. In this, again, they agree with creation, which lasted six days, man being created on the sixth. Here, then, we have a parallel, if not for the birth of the Aeon, at least for the birth of the child, on the sixth day of the official year; for there can be no doubt that the *hexaemeron* of creation is modelled upon the six-day term of the New Year festivals. In the biblical account this fact is obscured by the revamping of the text in conformity with the later Jewish practice of holding festivals for seven days.

Al-Biruni says (p. 115): "However, those *origines mundi*, i. e. Adam and Eve, have been used as the epoch of an era. And some people maintain that *time* consists of cycles, at the end of which all created things perish,⁹ whilst they grow at the beginning; that each such cycle has a special Adam and Eve of its own, and that the chronology of this cycle depends on them." Again (p. 116): "Other people maintain that in each cycle a special Adam and Eve exist for each country in particular, and that hence the difference of human structure, nature, and language is to be derived." P. 55: "The Persians believe that the beginning of their year was fixed by the creation of the first man, and that this took place on the day Hurmuz of Farwardîn Mâh [i. e. on Farvardin 1, 1st month], whilst the sun stood in the point of the vernal equinox in the middle of heaven. This occurred at the beginning of the seventh millennium,¹⁰ according to their view of the millennia of the world. The astrologers hold similar opinions, viz. that Cancer is the horoscope of the world." The Persians, however, were not content

* The New Year's festivals of the Persians were Naurôz and Mihrajân. Al-Biruni says (p. 208): "Alkisirâwi relates:—'I heard the Maubadh of Almutawakkil say: On the day of Mihrajân the sun rises in Hâmin in the midst between light and darkness. Then the souls die within the bodies; therefore the Persians called this day Mshragân.'" As Hâmin appears to be an intermediate place between heaven and hell, there may be a connection between this and the Descent to Hell as well as Purgatory. Further reasons might be cited for this conjecture, but limits of space forbid going into them here. Al-Biruni (p. 219) mentions the belief that man's spirits leave their bodies at full moon. This is the time of the Jewish pilgrimages.

with a single New Year's day. Not only the 1st, but also the 6th Farvardin was Naurôz (New Year's day), the former characterized as the "Little," the latter as the "Great." Of the latter Al-Biruni says (p. 201): "On the 6th Farwardîn, the day Khurdâsh, is the Great Naurôz, for the Persians a feast of great importance. On this day, they say, God finished the creation, for it is the last of the six days, mentioned before. On this God created Saturn, therefore its most lucky hours are those of Saturn.¹⁰ On the same day, they say, the *Sors Zarathustræ* came to hold communion with God, and Khaikhusrau ascended into the air. On this day the happy lots are distributed among the people of the earth. Therefore the Persians call it 'the day of hope.' " We have thus two New Year's days succeeding one another after an interval of five days. The same is true of Mihrajân, the corresponding festival falling in the seventh month; the precise days on which it began and ended are differently reported and need not detain us here. We shall presently see that Mihrajân also had its associations with creation; but before we speak of these things attention should be called to another group of festivals observed among the Persians. At somewhat irregular intervals, apparently determined by the agricultural seasons, were held six festivals known as Gahanbars, each held for terms of six days, to which the several works of creation were assigned. The sixth and last Gahanbar seems, at least originally, to have coincided with the five Gatha (or epagomenal) days *plus* (the Little Naurôz or) New Year's day. Hence in this scheme also creation is completed on a sixth day, which is, however, New Year's day; for the Persian calendar provides a vague year of 365 days composed of twelve months of 30 days each *plus* the five epagomenal days, or epact. Hence, reckoning from the close of the year proper,—i. e. of the 12th month,—New Year's day is the sixth. Spiegel and Darmstetter, remarking the close parallel which this elaborate scheme presents to the biblical account of creation, concluded that the Avesta was in this respect influenced by Jewish ideas. This judgment is utterly unsound, as will presently appear from a

¹⁰ For the connection of Saturn with the sixth and New Year's days, see below, p. 232.

comparison of the festival arrangements of other peoples; but even if these Iranian scholars could be pardoned for their ignorance of these other things, they ought at least to have known the facts relating to Iran. For Al-Biruni tells us (pp. 56, 57) that both the Sogdians and the Chorasmians commenced their years with the Great Naurôz, *i. e.* Farvardin 6. How deeply this scheme entered into Iranian chronology may be seen by another datum given by Al-Biruni (p. 205): "The 6th day [of Khurdâdh-Mâh, the 3d Persian month], or Khurdâdh-Rôz, is a feast Khurdâdhagân, so called on account of the identity of the name of the month and the day. The meaning of the name is the stability of the creation." Perhaps some Arabist will inform us whether we should not say "cessation" instead of "stability" here; but in any case, it is interesting to see creation once more brought into relation with a sixth day. Such things are not crudely borrowed from a people as far removed as the Jews.

It will now be of interest to note some of the associations of these Persian New Year's days, once more quoting Al-Biruni. P. 208: "On the same day [Mihrajân], they say, God spread out the earth and created the bodies as mansions for the souls. In a certain hour of this day the sphere Iفرانج‌آوی breathes for the purpose of rearing the bodies.¹¹ On the same day God is said to have clad the moon in her splendor and to have illumined her with her light. . . ." ¹² "The Persian theologians have derived various symbolic interpretations from these days. So they consider Mihrajân as a sign of resurrection and the end of the world, because at Mihrajân that which grows reaches its perfection and has no more material for further growth, and because animals cease from sexual intercourse.¹³ In the same way

¹¹ Above, p. 221, n. 9, we met the notion that the souls die within the bodies at Mihrajân. Taken in conjunction with this, it is obvious that this New Year festival had for the Persians suggestions not only of the end of the world and its re-creation but also of a personal death and resurrection.

¹² Whether this refers to new moon or to some other phase is not quite clear to me.

¹³ Aside from its reference to the seasons of the year there may be here a connection with the Babylonian *Descent of Ishtar*.

they make Naurôz a sign for the beginning of the world, because the contrary of all these things happens on Naurôz." This distribution among two festivals of acts which alike belong to the New Year should occasion no surprise. P. 99: "Persian scholars say that in the day of Naurôz there is an hour in which the sphere of Fêrôz is driven on by the spirits for the purpose of renovating the creation." That this undetermined hour was the sixth will presently appear probable.

While students of Jewish eschatology have discovered many points of agreement between it and the thought of the Persians, and a few significant ones between it and the Egyptian, little has hitherto been discovered regarding Babylonian eschatology. Yet there is at least one point of interest that should be brought out. In the Babylonian *Epic of Creation* Marduk on the occasion of his enthronement destroys and again restores a garment by the word of his mouth (*Tab. iv, 29 sq.*). This clearly symbolizes the destruction and re-creation of the world. Now, for our present purpose, it is of importance that in Babylonian thought creation is inextricably interwoven with the observances of the two New Year festivals which fall, like the Jewish and the Persian, respectively in the first and seventh months. Furthermore we are now, through the recent publication of the texts,¹⁴ placed in the fortunate position of being able to make out the scheme of these festivals. It would require more space than I may properly claim to set forth the evidence at present, and I must therefore content myself with stating the result of my analysis. The festivals seem to have corresponded exactly, occupying the period from the first to the eleventh of their respective months: the first five days are preliminary, the festival reaching its height in the latter part, which begins on the night between the fifth and sixth, and extends to the eleventh. During this period Nebo of Borsippa pays his annual visit to his father, Marduk, at Babylon. We may therefore be sure that the first and sixth are the high days, the New Year's days *par excellence*, among the Babylonians, as among the Persians. Among the

¹⁴ H. Zimmern, in *Verh. der Sächs. Gesells. der Wiss., Philol-Hist. Kl.*, vol. 58 (1906), Heft 3, and *ibid.* vol. 70 (1918), Heft 5; F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituel Accadien*, 1921.

latter the presence of the Gatha-days enables us to see that both these high days are sixth days. If we reckon the eleventh at Babylon a high day, as we probably should, it too is a sixth day. Since creation and the renovation of the world are so closely connected with the New Year's festival, we may be sure that they were significantly associated with sixth days. This is the more probable because it is well known that the number six was especially sacred among the Babylonians, and that terms of five days (erroneously called "weeks") frequently occur in the cultus of Marduk. It is the more noteworthy, therefore, that—so far as I know—there is no evidence of a five-day epact in the Babylonian calendar, though Kugler long ago produced the proof that for commercial purposes there existed a year of 360 days, thirty days to a month. Since the value of 365 days for the year was early known to the Babylonians, one may speak of a *constructive epact*, which was, however, obscured by the practice of occasionally or periodically intercalating a whole month.

In Egypt the calendar is very ancient. From the time of the first dynasty onward it retained essentially the same form, the vague year of 365 days, consisting of 12 months of 30 days *plus* a five-day epact, the epagomenae being reckoned now with the preceding, now with the following year. As the *dies natales* of the five Osiride divinities, born "neither in month nor in year," they were a solemn season having a ritual of their own. Since overlapping festivals, beginning in one month and concluded on the first day of the following, were common in Egypt, we may be sure that the solemnities of the turn of the year included New Year's day, the more as the first day of every month was a festival in honor of the whole pantheon, especially of the Osiride gods. Here, then, we have what might be regarded as the typical form of the New Year festival, New Year's day falling on the sixth day after the close of the year properly so called. When we add to this the evidence, adduced by Norden after others, of the birth of Aeon and Osiris on Tybi 6, we have once more the reduplication of New Year after an interval of five days. Parenthetically one may here refer to the repeated Passovers mentioned in the Hebrew tradition.

No doubt some will be inclined to say, that this showing argues strongly in favor of Norden's hypothesis that this entire

scheme, of which to be sure he betrays very little knowledge, is derived from Egypt. But this conclusion is not warranted either by our knowledge of the historical relations between the countries in question or by reasonable reflection on the character of the observances. Moreover, there is very disconcerting evidence of similar schemes observed by other peoples whom it would be folly in the present state of our knowledge to suppose dependent on Egypt. In Greece, New Year's festivals, recognized as such, are conspicuously absent; but sixth days, generally with the same associations as the New Year's days we have been considering, play a considerable rôle. This fact might be explained by the hypothesis of borrowing from Anatolia, where, if space were granted, it could be shown that the same forms largely prevailed. It will be admitted that the probability of Anatolian and Hellenic borrowing from Egypt is very slight. That the *bissexus*, inserted after the Terminalia even in the pre-Julian Roman calendar, makes of the last five days of February a virtual epact, is at once obvious. Parenthetically I may remark that the recognition of this fact settles the question, erroneously answered by Mommsen, as to the place of the *bissexus*: it fell of course between the Terminalia and the epact. Whence this arrangement of the Roman calendar was derived is an unsolved mystery: Egypt seems not a likely place of origin, though Julius Caesar doubtless derived help from Egypt. In Greece, so far as I know, there is no calendary epact. Even more difficult to connect with Egypt is the practice of the Druids reported by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 16. 250. Speaking of the mistletoe found on the oak he says: "Est autem id rarum admodum inuentu et repertum magna religione petitur et ante omnia sexta luna, quae principia mensum annorumque his facit et saeculi post tricesimum annum, quia iam uirium abunde habeat nec sit sui dimidia." After noting these negative instances it may seem superfluity of naughtiness to refer to the existence of a five-day epact in the calendars of the Mayas and Aztecs with the expectation that the end of the world may come on New Year's day at the expiry of a term of fifty-two years. If I were asked where this scheme originated, my answer must be that I do not know, and that at present no one can say any more than that. The contemplation of the facts adduced, which might be indefinitely multi-

plied, should be a wholesome lesson to those who, upon a few isolated data, hazard a pronouncement on the subject of origins. One gains nothing by substituting Egypt for the *fons et origo* proclaimed by the Panbabylonians.

Though we may never know whence these ideas spread, it is a fact easily demonstrated that they prevailed practically everywhere in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin. The sixth day,—the day of Epiphany, of the Nativity,¹⁵ of the creation of man, of the birth of the Aeon, of the Crucifixion, of the Transfiguration, of Passover, of Tabernacles, of Jum'ah, the Mohammedan day of assembly,—possessed solemn associations, which are but faintly reflected in the modern superstitions about Friday. If one follows the clews which a knowledge of this fact affords, one may prove the connection of great groups of data which have hitherto remained unrelated, or have been compared on the ground of a general resemblance only that might be the result of the merest chance. A few illustrations will presently be given. Meanwhile it may be well to point out that the sort of equation just made between various sixth days is not, as it might seem, purely fanciful, but quite in the manner of men to whom such things were sacred. Though little understood in the West, except by Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine, all of whom had intimate connections with the East, the Greek Fathers revelled in them, despite the biblical deprecation of the practice of observing days and seasons. To most of them the connection of these ideas with New Year's observances had become obscure, if indeed the confusion of calendars had not quite effaced it. Here and there, however, it is still quite plain to us. Thus Ginzler (iii. 179) says: "Der 25. März galt bei vielen Komputisten als wichtiger Tag, da er als Datum der Geburt Jesu, der Weltschöpfung, aber auch als Tag des Todes Jesu und Tag der Auferstehung angenommen wurde." This is quite in the manner of good Bishop Victorinus of Petau (*De fabrica mundi*, *Patr. Lat.*, 5, 313): "Ea die natum esse

¹⁵ The Nativity was first dated at Epiphany (Jan. 6); but when it was removed to Christmas the Eastern Church retained the same scheme, appointing Dec. 20 the *proëortia*, thus making Christmas a sixth day.

Christum, qua hominem finxit, eadem die esse passum, quo Adam cecidit." If one wishes a perfect example, let him consult Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6. 16, p. 812 P., where Jesus, on the mount of Transfiguration ("after six days," and observed on August 6), is called "the fourth" (being accompanied by Peter, James, and John) and "the sixth" (by the addition of Moses and Elias),—thereby, perhaps, accounting for the Christian "stations" on the *feria quarta* and *feria sexta*,—and finally, proclaimed by the Voice, the seventh, becomes "the eighth," in obvious allusion to the Lord's day as the eighth. In this connection he mentions the hexad as declaring His birth. One may refer also to the fact that in the genealogy of *Matthew*, 1. 17, Jesus likewise appears as the sixth, at least as the passage is interpreted by Clement (*Strom.* 1. 21, p. 411 P.). A most significant passage occurs in Augustine, *De diversis quaest.* 44 (*Patr. Lat.*, 40, 54 sq.), where Jesus is said to have come in the sixth age of man, on the sixth day, at the sixth hour, citing the fact (*John* 4. 6) that the Saviour appeared to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well "at the sixth hour." This would be quite unintelligible to us, if we did not have other means of knowing why this was said: it is of course obvious that the Saviour was somehow connected with the number six, but Augustine himself hardly gives us the necessary clew. This is happily provided by other texts. Christian eschatology, agreeing with that of the Jews, except in holding that the Messiah has already come, looks forward to the second advent at the end of the times. Every student of eschatology is aware that the scheme of the last days agrees with that of the pilgrimage festivals, though he may not be aware of the reason for this agreement. Reference was made above to the liturgy of the Jewish Passover and the association of the events expected at the end of the 'Olam or Aeon with the "Passover to come." Thus we understand the words of Jerome, *In Matth.* xxv. 6: "Traditio Judaeorum est Christum media nocte uenturum in similitudine Aegyptii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est et exterminator uenit et Dominus super tabernacula transiit." The Ambrosian hymn "Mediae noctis tempus est" connects the midnight Passover with the midnight coming of the Bridegroom (*Matth.* 25. 6), and one must not forget that the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the Greek Church give

midnight as the hour of the Resurrection. Since midnight, like midday, is the sixth hour, the hour of the Crucifixion, one sees how important it is. Christian tradition in turn sets the hour of the Nativity at midnight on December 24 to 25 or January 5 to 6—in other words at the very moment of the transition from the fifth to the sixth day. One recalls that Passover also is dated the 14th or 15th Nisan, the hour being the line of demarkation between the days. That this is to be connected with the passage from the last day of the epact to New Year's day should be obvious.¹⁶ Syrian Christians differ regarding the date of the Nativity, some assigning it to Friday, while the majority say it was Thursday, as the Mohammedans question whether the Prophet began his Flight on a Thursday or a Friday, though most take the former view. One recalls also the so-called "anticipated" Passover of Maundy Thursday, when the Lord's Last Supper was held. Though Egypt may have no elaborate eschatology, it follows the same scheme. In lieu of the Last Judgment at the end of the world the Egyptian believed in a judgment undergone by each decedent when he mounted the bark of Ra and took the voyage through the twelve stations of the night: the judgment took place when the dead reached the judgment seat of Osiris, set up in the sixth region. The judgment therefore falls at the sixth hour—midnight. One might pursue this subject much farther, but let this suffice.

Let me now show by several examples how groups of data, which have hitherto been either unrelated or precariously connected solely on the ground of a certain superficial resemblance, can be proved to stand in a very close relation, once the scheme has been recognized. In his *Schöpfung und Chaos* Gunkel pointed out that the myth of Rahab, the dragon, is associated alike with creation and the end of the 'Olam; and, recognizing the kinship of this myth with that of Tiamat, who is slain by Marduk, he

¹⁶ Chabas, *Le calendrier des jours fastes et néfastes*, p. 210, says of the fifth day of the Egyptian epact: "Nom de ce jour: 'Le jeune qui est dans son nid est son nom'." . . . "Le même nom propre, pour le cinquième des épagomènes, est mentionné dans les inscriptions du temple de Dendérah (Dümichen, *Bauurkunden*, Taf. 18, l. 17). Le jeune dieu, qui est Osiris ressuscité, prend naissance dans la nuit du dernier jour de l'année."

insisted on the Babylonian origin of this motif. Whatever one may think of his conclusion, there can be no doubt that there is a connection between the Hebrew and the Babylonian myths; for the latter forms a part of the story of creation which is associated with the New Year festival. Similar myths exist in India, but I have no means of establishing a direct connection between them and either the Hebrew or the Babylonian, though it is not improbable, because the Hindu and the Iranian present so close a parallel that they can hardly be divorced. As for the Iranian myths of this character their connection with creation is made obvious by the Avesta, while Al-Biruni establishes their connection with the New Year festivals. Thus he says (p. 209): "On the 21st, or Râm-Rôz, is the *Great Mihrajân* in commemoration of Frêdûn's [Feridun's] subduing and binding Al-Dahhâk [Satan]. . . . Thereupon he put him in fetters and imprisoned him in the mountain Dubâwand. Thereby people were freed from his wickedness, and they celebrated this event as a feast. Frêdûn ordered them to gird¹⁷ themselves with *Kustiks*, . . . as a tribute of thanks to God for having again made them their own masters¹⁸ with regard to their whole behavior and to the times of their eating and drinking, after they had been living in fear so long as 1000 years. This has come down as a rule and custom on the day of Mihrajân." Elsewhere (p. 202) the similar story of Jam [Jamshid] and his expedition against 'Iblîs is brought into relation with Naurôz, and again (p. 220) the difference in regard to the New Year epochs in use in Sogdiana and Persia is explained by saying that the Sogdiana "preferred to use as New Year that moment when Jam returned successful [from his attack on 'Iblîs], whilst the [Persian] kings preferred as New Year that moment when Jam started." Here the exodus and the nostos are divorced, as above we saw creation and the end of the world distributed between the two New Year festivals. Each festival properly had both an exodus and a

¹⁷ As the Hebrews girded their loins at Passover; Jesus girded himself with a towel at the Last Supper (*John* 13. 4-5). The Persian festival, like Passover and the Lord's Supper was essentially a commemorative repast.

¹⁸ As the Hebrews were delivered from bondage to the Egyptians. To the Jews this is the type of salvation.

nostos.¹⁹ The exploit of Feridun against Dahhak furnishes a suggestive commentary on the myth of the passion and triumph of Marduk at the vernal New Year festival,²⁰ which has latterly attracted so much attention. Superficially less similar but certainly parallel to it are the Egyptian myths of the conflict between Horus and Set and between Ptah (or Ra) and Apophis. This is shown by an inscription of the time of Amenhotep III., in which the king in uttering a threat says, "They shall become like the snake of Hell Apophis on the morning of the New Year; they shall be overwhelmed in the great flood."²¹ In the Egyptian myth Set is not slain, but released upon terms;²² to this we have, apparently, a Persian parallel in the statement of Al-Biruni (p. 208): "Alêrânshahrî says: God has made a treaty between Light and Darkness on Naurôz and Mihrajân"; for that all these myths are at least in some aspects solar hardly admits of question. Of course, on reading this Egyptian inscription one thinks inevitably of the apocalyptic vision of the end of the world (*Rev.* 20. 1 sq.): "And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished: after this he must be loosed for a little time." From what has been already said we should be able to guess that Satan was, or was to be, bound at the beginning of the Aeon, in this case the millennium; Au-

¹⁹ This might be illustrated by many examples, as by the Hebrew exodus, which was one pilgrimage, framed at the beginning by the departure from Egypt and at the end by the "return" to Canaan. An equally good illustration may be found by comparing what Al-Biruni says (p. 207 sq.) about the first, or Little, Mihrajân with the statement above quoted in part about the Great Mihrajân, in regard to Feridun.

²⁰ Transcription and translation by H. Zimmern, "Zum babyl. Neujahrsfest, Zweiter Beitrag," in *Ber. über die Verh. der Sächs. G. der Wiss.*, Leipzig, vol. 70 (1918), p. 2 sq.

²¹ Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt*, I, p. 434.

²² Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.* 40. Horus, whom Tertullian calls the Valentinian Aeon, overcomes Set *χρόνος*, 'in course of time.'

gustine *De civ. Dei*, 20. 6-8 makes it all plain by dating the event on the sixth day. Satan would of course be freed after a thousand years to a day, "for a little time," as the fettered Kronos, likewise sent to the under-world, was bound and then released at the Saturnalia (Macrobian, *Sat.* 1. 8. 5). That the Saturnalia were connected with the turn of the year,—indeed, that they constituted an interlude or interregnum²³ like the epact, requires no argument. A study of the rites of Kronos-Saturn shows clearly his connection with the sixth day, but I cannot here give the evidence.²⁴ The battles of the Olympian gods against the Giants and Titans duplicate one another: Kronos is the king of the Titans (Apollon. Rhod. *Arg.* 1. 507), and doubtless of the Giants. On the Hill of Kronos at Olympia the Basilae offered a sacrifice to Kronos at the vernal equinox, because he there wrestled with Zeus (Pausan. 8. 2, 2). The occasion was doubtless that of the battle of the Giants, from which Kronos came to this hill, thus giving it its name (Pseudo-Plut., *De fluviis*, 19. 3). On what day this battle was decided we learn from another source (Leutsch, *Paroemiographi*, 1. 401): ἔκτη ἡμέρα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ μυθεύεται τοὺς θεοὺς νενικηκέναι τοὺς γίγαντας. Lydus, *De mens.* 4. 3, p. 66, 18 sq. W., says that the Roman *ovatio*, held on Jan. 1, celebrated the victory of Zeus over the Giants. How widely this feeling prevailed in Greece might be shown by a study of the days on which the great battles of Greek history were commemorated. For want of space to point this out in detail, let me refer the student to Aelian, *V. H.*, 2. 25.

I will give one more illustration of the way in which observances thus reveal their essential connection. Norden says (p. 35) that January 6 (Nativity-Epiphany) was adopted into the Christian festival calendar from the mysteries of Dionysus-Osiris, basing his conclusions on the²⁵ concurrence (noted by Holl) on this date of the birth of Osiris at the time of the cere-

²³ It is known that the *interregnum* at Rome was always for a term of five days, the term, in case of need, being repeated *ad libitum*.

²⁴ See above, p. 222, for the birth of Saturn at Naurôz. That Saturn is the god of Time is stated by the Fathers. The Babylonians call the planet Saturn "the star of Helios."

²⁵ Cp. above, n. 16.

mony of drawing water, which formed part of the festival of the Pamyliæ, with the festival of Dionysus on Andros, at which a spring was supposed to flow having a taste of wine. That there is a connection between these festivals need not be called in question; but, again, a wider survey of the available evidence will hardly serve to confirm the inference drawn from the few facts cited. That Norden should not have known at least a part of this other evidence is less surprising than that his theologian friends should be ignorant of it. The *Gospel of John* (7. 37), reporting the words of Jesus spoken at the Feast of Tabernacles, which have long been recognized as referring at more than one point to the observances of that New Year's festival, says that on that day Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water," and adds, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him were to receive." Theologians long ago saw in these words an allusion to the rite of drawing water at Tabernacles from the pool of Siloam. This pool, however, was ancient, though we do not know how early the rite was practised there. Libations of water were of ancient use at Hebrew fasts (*i. Sam.* 7. 6; *ii. Sam.* 26. 16). The Mishnah (*Succah*, c. 4) says that at Tabernacles a pitcher of gold was carried to the altar filled with water from Siloam; there it was poured into a basin on the West, while wine was poured into one at the East. Both basins were perforated, so that the liquid might flow out; but the Talmud does not disclose whither the libations flowed, though one surmises that the water was conducted to the West, the wine to the East.²⁶ The wine-offering seems to be of later origin, though the date of its introduction (probably from the daily offering, which came apparently after *Ezekiel*) cannot be determined. The prophets abound in allusions to similar rites, though they do not mention the wine. Thus *Zechariah* (14. 7 sq.), referring to the great and terrible last day, says: "It shall be one day which is known to Jehovah; not day, and not night; but it shall come to pass that at evening time there shall be

²⁶ Among the Jews, as with the Greeks, the East belongs to God and the good, the West to Satan and the evil. Wine is not offered to the dead, or the gods of the dead, who receive water (wineless) libations.

light.²⁷ And it shall come to pass on that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward the western sea." Here one is fairly compelled to think that the prophet had in mind a festival like Tabernacles. The living waters are those of a spring, and are divided, as were all the *sacra* of the Hebrew religion. It must be recalled that the Jews connected the incident of Meribah also with the Feast of Tabernacles and its rite of drawing water. To this Paul (*i. Cor.* 10. 4) alludes when he says: "They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ." The Hebrew tradition, especially in the *hallel* sung at the opening of the pilgrimage festivals, frequently refers to God as the Rock of Israel, and Christian hymnology retains the figure in reference to Christ as the Rock of Ages cleft for sinners. The rite of drawing water at Tabernacles was the most ecstatic of all, being celebrated with dances, in which even the sages participated with lighted tapers (*Sukkah*, 4). The interpretation of Jesus' words as said in reference to the Spirit is made intelligible by the fact that the Talmud speaks of the *sukkah*, the booth of Tabernacles, as "the house of the drawing of water," because the Holy Spirit was drawn from it.²⁸ If we took the requisite space, it might readily be shown that the incident of Meribah reflects a Passover, which would yield another link connecting the rite of drawing water with the New Year. We need not then look to Egypt and the rites of (a Greek) Dionysus or an Egyptian Osiris for this rite or for its association with the sixth or New Year's day. These were ancient folk-customs, which are not readily transferred from land to land. The only thing that remains to be explained is the wine libation, for which, so far as I know, there is no reason to look to Egypt: nor is the rite of Andros eligible as a possible source. On the other hand a suggestion at least of a rite akin alike to that of Andros and the Jewish Tabernacles is contained in the incident of the miracle of Jesus at the marriage feast at

²⁷ Presumably said in allusion to the illumination which was a marked feature of many festivals: whence the name Φῶτα given to Hanukkah, a replica of Tabernacles, celebrated Kislev (December) 25, and to Epiphany.

²⁸ References in Jewish Encycl., xi, 661^b.

Cana. Here, as Professor Bacon pointed out,²⁹ there is in the Gospel story indicated a term of six days; and this miracle, the first recorded of the Master, is commemorated at Epiphany. In Jewish tradition there is a hint that the incident at Meribah underwent the same transformation as the rite of Siloam. In *Numbers* 20. 11 it is reported that Moses smote the rock twice and water came forth abundantly; but the *Targum of Palestine* (on *Num.* c. xx, p. 406 Etheridge) says that when Moses smote the rock "at the first time it dropt blood, but at the second time there came forth a multitude of waters." One recalls that Moses smote the river (Nile) with his rod and converted it into blood. Possibly there is here an intelligible symbolism; for the Hebrews were quite familiar with the notion that wine was "the blood of the grape" (*Gen.* 49. 11; *Deut.* 32. 14; *Sirach* 39. 26, 50. 15). Christians, from Paul onward, saw in the rock of Meribah a type of Christ, whose blood is drunk in the wine of the eucharist: hence it was doubtless regarded as especially significant that when His side was struck and pierced at the Crucifixion by the soldier's spear, "straightway there came out blood and water" (*John* 19. 34; cf. *Baruch* 4. 15). The mention of the Nile in the miracle of Moses must not, however, mislead us into seeking the source of the rite and its associations in Egypt; for, excepting the wine, rites not unlike that of Siloam are abundantly attested in Persia, especially at New Year festivals which, as we have seen, fall on sixth days. Here we may again avail ourselves of data furnished by Al-Biruni. He relates several stories to explain the rites of sprinkling or washing with water on Naurôz, New Year's day. The first (p. 199) tells how a swallow met Solomon carrying water in its beak, which it sprinkled before the king; other versions may be quoted at length (p. 202 sq.). "He (Jamshid) ordered people to wash themselves with water in order to cleanse themselves of their sins, and to do so every year that God might keep them aloof from the calamities of the year. Some people maintain that Jam ordered channels to be dug, and that the water was led into them on this day. Therefore people rejoiced at their prosperity, and washed themselves in the water that was sent³⁰ them

²⁹ "After Six Days," *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, viii (1915), 94 sq.

³⁰ "Siloam" also is "sent" water.

(by the channels), and in this respect the later generations have considered it a good omen to imitate the former ones. Others, again, maintain that he who let the water into the channels was Zû, after Afrâsiâb had ruined all the dwellings of Erânshahr. According to another view, the cause of the washing is this—that this day is sacred to Harûdhâ, the angel of the water, who stands in relation to the water.³¹ Therefore people rose on this day early, at the rising of dawn, and went to the water of the aqueducts and wells. Frequently, too, they drew running water in a vase, and poured it over themselves, considering this a good omen and a means to keep off hurt. On the same day people sprinkle water over each other, of which the cause is said to be the same as that of the washing. According to another report, the reason was this—that during a long time the rain was withheld from Erânshahr, but that they got copious rain when Jamshid, having ascended the throne,³² brought them the good news of which we have spoken [that he had overcome Al-Dahhak]. Therefore they considered the rain a good omen, and poured it over each other, which has remained among them as a custom. According to another explanation this water-sprinkling simply holds the place of purification, by which people cleansed their bodies from the smoke of the fire and from the dirt connected with attending to the fires. Besides it serves the purpose of removing from the air that corruption which produces epidemic and other diseases.” Again (p. 206), similar practices are reported as in vogue Tîr-Mâh 13 at the feast Tiragân, and (p. 215) Bahman-Mâh 30 at Ispahan. Though it cannot be proved, it is not unlikely that both occasions are old New Year festivals. In the latter passage occurs the motif of “hardening the heart” (which clearly belongs to the fast) familiar to us from the biblical references to the desert pilgrimage and particularly the incident of Meribah. Finally one may refer to the well-known

³¹ One is reminded of the incident of the pool of Bethesda (*John* 5, 1 sq.), which occurred at a feast of the Jews. Some have identified this as Pentecost; but that is unlikely, because it occurred on a sabbath, and Pentecost would be dated on the morrow after the sabbath. Passover and Tabernacles were commonly regarded as Sabbaths in the days of Jesus: it is therefore more likely to have been Tabernacles.

³² The enthronement of the king or god is another New Year theme.

custom of blessing the waters of the Jordan at Epiphany. A glance at the Persian traditions reported by Al-Biruni will convince one that the custom of drawing water at New Year must have been very ancient and is not at all likely to have been derived from Egypt, say, during the period of the Persian rule in that land. It will likewise show that the practice was closely akin to that of the Jews both at Tabernacles and on the Day of Atonement.

There are many questions inevitably raised by the data which have been here brought together and the much larger number of essentially the same character which might be adduced. Some may no doubt be capable of solution, and on another occasion I may be tempted to offer suggestions to that end; but this discussion has already run to a length beyond what was contemplated, and I must close. I trust I have sufficiently shown that Professor Norden's attempt to refer to Egypt the entire tradition of the Aeon and the divine child expected at its inception fails for want of a general survey of the available data.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

II.—PHILOLOGICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDIES.¹

1. Camel and Cable.

Jesus says (Mark 10, 25; cf. Matt. 19, 24; Luke 18, 25): *It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.* A camel going through a needle's eye is a proverbial saying like the Lat. *cum mula peperit*, or the Fr. *croire voir les étoiles en plein midi*, or the Ger. *das Gras wachsen hören* (for ὀξύνκοον εἶναι) which is derived from a passage in the Younger Edda (Simrock 1, 27) where this faculty is ascribed to Heimdall. *Needle's eye* cannot denote a small door in the panel of the city gate (Rodwell's *Koran*² 319⁴; Penrice's dictionary 72^a). The small panel-door is not called *needle's eye*, and no camel, even if stripped of its load, could be forced through it, because it is only from 3 to 4 feet high, and 1½ to 2 feet wide (DB 1, 345^b).² The Arabic name of this small opening is not *samm-al-xiîâṭ*, eye of a needle (Hommel, *Säugetiere* 145⁴) but *xáuxah* = Eth. *xôxt*, door (GB¹⁶ 217^b; NBSS 151). In the Talmud (BT 6, 601, l. 16) we read that the people of *Pûmbêḏîṭâ* deemed themselves so clever that they could put an elephant through a needle's eye (*mě'aijēlîn pîlâ bē-qûpâ da-měḥâṭṭâ*). Aram. *pîlâ*, of course, is not the Lat. *pilum*, Fr. *fil*, but denotes *elephant*, Ass. *pîru* (JBL 40, 171). Cf. also Matt. 23, 24 (*strain out the gnat and swallow the camel*). Nor can we assume (RB 830; RE³ 21, 747^a) that Jesus used the Aramaic word *nîqbâ*, hole (JHUC 163, 62^b) which may denote not only *eye of a needle* (Syr. *mâqqēbâ* < *manqabâ*; Delitzsch's Heb. NT has *nāqb-ham-mahḥâṭ*) but also *tunnel* (Arab. *naqb*, *mānqab*). With the addition *da-mě-ḥâṭṭâ*, of a needle, there could be no ambiguity.

Some later MSS read in Mark 10, 25 and the two parallel

¹ The following eight brief communications are abstracts of papers presented at the monthly meetings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association during the academic session 1923/4 on Oct. 18, Nov. 15, Dec. 20, Jan. 17, Feb. 21, Mar. 20, Apr. 10, and May 15, respectively.

² For the abbreviations see vol. 43 of this JOURNAL, p. 238, n. 2.

passages *κάμλος*, cable, instead of *κάμηλος*, camel. This reading is followed in the Armenian version (5th cent.) and is mentioned by Cyril of Alexandria (who died in 444). Also in the Koranic passage (7, 38): *Those who deem our signs frauds . . . will not enter Paradise till a camel pass through a needle's eye* there is a variant *júmmal*, rope, instead of *jámal*, camel. *Κάμλος* does not occur in Greek literature; it is mentioned, however, by Suidas (c. 970) and in the Aristophanic scholia in connection with a passage (1030) in *The Wasps*. It is the prototype of our *cable* which is generally derived from the late Lat. *capulum* (or *caplum*) a halter for catching or fastening cattle (< *capere*). But a cable is not a lasso or lariat. Nor can it be connected with *catabola*, a kind of *ballista* for hurling stones, which was put in motion by ropes. Some modern Greek dictionaries have *κάμλος*, cable; but the common expression is *palamári* or *kálos* (κάλως). The Arabic lexicographers state that *júmmal* (or *júmal*, *juml*, *júmul*, *jumâlah*) is called also *qals*. While Arab. *qals* < κάλως (which is connected with κλώθειν, to spin) *κάμηλος* and *κάμλος* are Semitic loanwords.

In the 15th or 16th centuries we often find the form *gable* instead of *cable*. We have it also in the enlarged edition of Hakluyt's *Voyages*, published c. 1600 (*they had neither oars, masts, sails, gables*) and (c. 1614) in Chapman's *Odyssey*. The oldest form is *gabula* (recorded in 1193). The *g* is due to partial assimilation: in Semitic, surds often become sonants under the influence of *l*, *r*, *m*, *n*.³ The names Tiglath-pileser and Sargon have a *k* in Assyrian. On the other hand, Arab. *kuhl*, kohl (> *alcohol*; OLZ 17, 53, n. 2) appears in Assyrian as *guxlu*. Ass. *udru*, Bactrian camel (Arab. *jámalu*-s-sanâ-mâini) < *utru*⁴ < Pers. *uštra*, camel, which we have in the name of Zoroaster, *Zarathushtra* > mod. Pers. *Zardúsht*. Ass. *udru* represents a dialectic form *hutra* (there is no *h* in Assyrian) < *šutra* (mod. Pers. *šutúr* or *uštúr*).⁵ Heb. *gop̄rîṭ*, sulphur, is

³ See JAOS 43, 121^m. 424, l. 10. 425^m; cf. Brugmann's *Grundriss*¹ 1, § 568, 2.

⁴ Cf. Arab. *fádara*, to be exhausted (orig. *broken* = weakened) < *fá-tara mina*-l-dirâbi < *fárta* (Ass. *purru*).

⁵ Contrast Av. *udra*, otter; Lat. *lutra*, Sp. *nutria*, Gr. *ἐνδρίς*; cf. Lagarde, *Beiträge zur baktrischen Lexikographie* (1868) p. 70.

the Aram. *kibrîṭ* < *kiprîṭ* (BL 128). Arab. *rijâm*, pl. of *rújmah*, < *rikâm* = *rakâm*, *heap* (JBL 40, 171^m). Our *guitar* (cf. *gittern*) < *κιθάρα* > *cithara*, *cithern*, *cittern*, *cither*, *zithern*, *zither*, *citole*. The old name of Gallipoli was *Καλλίπολις*. According to Pliny (3, 120) the Adriatic was originally called *Atriaticum*. In modern Greek, *nt* becomes *nd*, and *mp*: *mb*; *ἀντί* appears as *andí*; Lat. *antenna*, sail-yard (which may be a corruption of *ἀνατεταμένος*) is *andéna*; *ἀμπελών*, vineyard: *ambelónas*; It. *endivia* (< Lat. *intibum*, *intubum* > *ἐντυβον* and Arab. *híndab*) is therefore spelled *ἀντίδια*. According to Ember, *g* in Hebrew names containing a media or liquida (e. g. Gibeá, Gibeon, Gilgal, Megiddo) is written *k* in Egyptian, because *k* in such cases was pronounced *g* (cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² § 22, n. 1, and Babyl. *Kûbâra* = OP *Gauḫbaruḫa*, Gobryas).⁶ We pronounce *Israel*, *crimson*, *Windsor*, *asthma* with *z* instead of *s*.

The *g* in Heb. *gamál*, camel, is later than the *k* in *κάμηλος* (*Est.* 57). *Gamál*, camel < **kamal*, humped. Arab. *júblah* < **kumlah* means *hump* of a camel. Ass. *gungupu*, hump (ZA 34, 197) < *gubgubu* is derived from the same root as is also the common Arabic term for mountain: *jábal*. Arab. *sanâm*, hump of a camel (which may be connected with *samânah*, fatness) denotes also *hill*. The highest mountain in the Odenwald, between the Neckar and the Main, is called *Katzenbuckel*. Our *buckler*, shield, is derived from *bocla*, boss of a shield, which is called in German: *Buckel*, and *boss* was formerly used for *humpback* (Ger. *Buckel*; cf. Fr. *la bosse du chameau*) while modern geologists apply this term to an irregular knob-like outcrop of eruptive rock, especially of granite, e. g. *a number of prominent crags and bosses projecting beyond the general surface of the ground* (CD 634^{c4}). *Κάμηλος* is originally a feminine collective (cf. Herod. 1, 80) < Arab. *jimâl* or (with *imâlah*; AJP 8, 280) *jimêl* (so e. g. in Jerusalem). We have this *ê* also in Fr. *chamelle*, while the masc. *chameau* represents an original *kamal*. In MHG the name was *kemel*, *kemmel*, or *kembel*. In Zurich there is a house *Zum Kämbel*. The *hump* of a camel is an accumulation of fat, and a *cable* is an accumulation of strands, while *gum* (Lat. *gummi* < *cummi* = *κομμι* = Heb. *al-*

⁶ There are no signs for *o* in the Assyrian script (ASKT 166, § 10; AJP 8, 287, n. 2).

gummîm; JEA 7, 83⁴) which is derived from the same root (cf. *κάγκαμον* = *cancamum*, Plin. 12, 98 < Arab. *kamkâm*, i. e. the gum-resin which is called in Hebrew: *çörî*) is an accumulation of latex. Heb. *gam*, also, means orig. *accumulation*; Ger. *auch* is connected with *αὐξάνειν*, *augere*.⁷

The explanations of *gamal*, camel, as *retaliative* (*μνησίκακος*) or *handsome*, or *full-grown*, or *massy*, bulky, or *beast of burden*, are untenable. While *asinus*, ass, is a Sumerian loanword (OLZ 18, 361, l. 14) *camel* is Semitic (Hommel, *Säugetiere* 144⁴; contrast SFG 70^m) < *km*, to heap > Arab. *kûmah* and *kûmzah*, heap; *âkamah*, heap of stones, elevation, hill; *kamm*, mass; Ass. *nakâmu*, to amass, heap up (*Isaiah* 119, 15). Arab. *kaumâ'u* (syn. *sânimah*) is a *she-camel with a large hump*. We have this root also in Arab. *tâmaka* (< *takama*) which means (the hump of the camel) *was high and fat*. In several Hebrew words (e. g. *gib'â*, hill) the root *km* appears as *gb*; cf. also Ass. *gabbu* (ZA 24, 151) and *nagbu* (ZA 30, 225⁸) totality = Arab. *jam'*, and Arab. *najm*, star < *nâjama*, to rise. For Ass. *gab'âni*, heights, and *gubbâni*, cisterns, see the paper on *σιρός*, silo, and *σωρός*, stack, in JBL 40, 171. As to the interchange of *b* and *m*, we find in the Koran (3, 90; cf. WdG 2, 228, l. 1) *Bâkkah* for Mecca (JAOS 43, 425, l. 9). Ass. *gammalu*, camel, is an Arabic loanword (BA 1, 171).

2. Salted with Fire.

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5, 13) Jesus says to His followers: *Ye are the salt of the earth*, i. e. *Ye keep the earth sweet*, preventing corruption and decomposition. Ass. *îâbtu*, salt, is the feminine of *îâbu*, good, which means orig. *sweet*, so that *îâbtu*, salt, signifies prop. *sweetener*, i. e. *keeping things sweet*, preventing putrescence and rancidity which would make them offensive, i. e. ill-smelling. Just as Ass. *îâbu*, good, means orig. *sweet-scented*, so the primary connotation of Ass. *bîšu*, evil, is *ill-smelling* (cf. Ex. 5, 21 and our *unsavory*). The strong-smelling goats symbolize evil (JAOS 42, 376⁴). Ass. *îâbtu*

⁷ Ger. *auch* is originally imperative (*add!*) like Ass. *ezib*, save (cf. Lat. *salvo eo quod* and Fr. *sauf*) = except, not including, in addition to, besides (contrast Zimmern, *Ištar-Saltu* 32⁴; see also OLZ 25, 405^m).

means both *salt* and *benefit*. We can say *It is very sweet of you* instead of *It is very good of you*. Ass. *ṭūbu* = *ṭūiūbu* (JBL 39, 153, l. 10) to make, build = Syr. *ṭaiiīb*, to prepare, means orig. *to do well* (JAOS 44, 168, l. 11). In Arab. *ṭāma-iaṭīmu*, to fashion, form, do well, we have *m* for *b*. In Aram. *ṭībbā*, rumor (orig. *ṭēbā*) < Ass. *ṭēmu* (= *ṭa'mu*) on the other hand (JAOS 32, 18) we find *b* for *m* (AJP 8, 269). Ass. *ṭēmu* was afterwards pronounced *ṭīu* (AJP 8, 266; 39, 307). Heb. *ṭīṭ*, clay (Ass. *ṭīṭu*) < *ṭīn-tu* < *ṭīm-tu*; cf. Heb. *ṭōṣér*, *πηλοπλάθος*, *figulus* < *iaṣár*, *πλάττειν*, *figere* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2, 80 and the Plautine *fictor fortunae* or *vitae agenda*). Lat. *figere* (> *fic-tile*, *figura*, *effigies*) is connected with *τείχος*, *τοιχος*, Av. *pairi-daêza* (= *περίτειχος*) > *παράδεισος*, and Ger. *Teig* (cf. BL 129). Our *dough* was used also for *potter's clay*. Ger. *Ton*, clay (Goth. *thâhō* < *than-hō*) seems to be a Semitic loanword.⁸

Herodotus' statement (1, 198; cf. PAPS 61, 232^m) that the Babylonians put dead bodies in honey may be due to a misunderstanding of the term *ṭābtu*, sweetener, i. e. salt (contrast Tallqvist, *Maqlû* 163^b) just as the rainbow in the Biblical story of the Flood seems to be based on the misreading of the ideogram for *muscaria* or *flabella* in l. 164 of the cuneiform account of the Deluge (KAT² 558^l. 517^s; JAOS 41, 181^l). Pliny (31, 98) calls salt *defuncta etiam a putrescendi tabe vindicans ut durent ita per saecula* (cf. Streck, *Assurb.* 404, ad 61). It is true, Pliny (22, 108) states also: *mellis quidem ipsius natura talis est ut putrescere corpora non sinat*.

In the appendix (contrast Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*² 77, l. 10) Mark 9, 49. 50 (after the secondary quotation from Is. 66, 24; cf. JHUC 306, 13^l; JBL 38, 46) *salted with fire* (*πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται*, *igne salietur*) does not mean *salted and smoked* (Lat. *sale et fumo indurati*). Nor can it be rendered *purified with fire* (salt does not purify) or *made acceptable to God*, because, according to the addition in Lev. 2, 13, all offerings had to be offered with salt. J. D. Michaelis (1790) said: man is *salted for the fire*, just as the sacrifices were salted (Joseph.

⁸ For Ger. *Ton* (pronounced *tone*) < Arab. *ṭīn* see BA 1, 252, l. 1; *Est.* 7, l. 12; cf. also Syr. *mētôm*, ever < Ass. *matī-ma*, whenever, while Syr. *immāt(ī)* when < Ass. *immatī-ma* < *ina-matī-ma* (AJSL 22, 251; JAOS 43, 425).

Ant. 9, 3, 1). The meaning of this *cruz interpretum* is *seasoned* (and hardened) *in the fire* of affliction. A modern writer might have used *steeled*, i. e. *made firm*, as hard as steel. Shakespeare uses *to season* for *to keep sweet*, fresh, preserve from decay. At the beginning of *Twelfth Night*, Valentine says to the Duke that Olivia will walk veiled like a cloistress,

all this to season
A brother's dead love, which she would keep fresh
And lasting in her sad remembrance.

Schlegel renders this: *balsamieren*, embalm (cf. Arab. *šáññaba* = *hánnaṣa*).

Timber is seasoned by drying and hardening it. A *salted* ship is a ship filled with salt between the timbers and the planks for the preservation of the wood. Posts that are to be fixed in the ground have their buried ends charred (cf. *praeustae sudes; stipites praeacuti et praeusti*, Caes. *B. G.* 5, 40; 7, 73). Strabo (168. 771) says that the inhabitants of the Balearic Islands charred the points of their wooden javelins, and that the Ethiopians of Endera (near Meroë) charred the heads of their arrows (cf. ZA 35, 151, 3: *era ša ina appi u-išdi išâta kabbu*). Odysseus charred the point of the pole of olive wood, cut from the Cyclopean club, which he plunged into the eye of Polyphemus (*Od.* 9, 328). The insides of barrels are often charred: American whiskies used to be stored in heavily charred barrels; the cleansing and purifying effect of the charcoal, formed by the burning of the cask, helped to mature the liquor (EB¹¹ 28, 593). We may also refer to the *ferrum candens* of the ancient surgeons (cf. *καίειν*, Xen. *An.* 5, 8, 18; *Mem.* 1, 2, 54, > *καυτήριον*, searing-iron).

Wood is often treated with creosote which smells like smoked meat. Creosote may be obtained from pyroligneous acid (*acetum pyroligneum crudum*) which may be used also for the preservation of meat (Ger. *Schnellräucherung*). Export tobacco, cured over slow open wood fires, kindled on the floor of the barn, which impart to it a creosotic flavor, is called *fire-cured*. In South Africa a horse which is immune from endemic horse-sickness by reason of a previous attack is termed a *salted* horse. We call a person experienced in some occupation: *salted*.

In Mark 9, 49 *salted* signifies *strong to endure hardship*. A

severe test is called a *fire ordeal* or *crucial test* (< *crucible*, not < *crux*). In OT a great trial is often referred to as a *furnace* for smelting ore, especially iron. Egypt is called the *iron-furnace* of Israel. But Mark 9, 49 does not allude to the purifying and refining of metal, although we have this figure in Mal. 3, 3 (JHUC 316, 28). *Salted with fire* means *seasoned by trials*, hardened by afflictions.

3. Mercury in Roman Medicine.

It is generally supposed that the special medicinal properties of mercury were not fully appreciated before the middle of the 16th century, and the extensive internal use of mercurial preparations is said to have been introduced by the founder of the Vienna school of medicine, Gerard van Swieten (1700-1772) who was Maria Theresa's physician and director of the imperial library. His son, who succeeded his father as Principal Librarian, was a friend of Haydn and Mozart; he furnished the text for Haydn's oratorios *The Creation* (1799) and *The Seasons* (1802). The Arabian physicians are said to have used mercury only for skin diseases, and mercury as a therapeutic agent is supposed to have been unknown to the Greeks and Romans.

But the Romans used minium, which according to Propertius (2, 3, 11) was a Hispanic word, not for red oxid of lead, but for native cinnabar, *i. e.* red sulphid of mercury, and Pliny (33, 116) says that, unfortunately, it is used by physicians, although it is poisonous: *at, Hercules, medici quia cinnabarim* (JBL 34, 72⁴) *vocant, utuntur hoc minio, quod venenum esse paulo mox docebimus*. In 33, 124 he says, he considers the medicinal use of the poisonous minium very risky; it should certainly not be used internally: *quod cum venenum esse conveniat, omnia quae de minio in medicinae usu traduntur temeraria arbitror*.

Pliny disliked medical men, although there were some good physicians in Rome during the last century of the Republic, *e. g.* Cicero's friend, the Bithynian Asclepiades who eschewed powerful remedies and relied on diet, exercise, massage, and cold baths. Even during the 19th century there was a strong prejudice against the use of mercury; some considered the remedy worse than the disease against which it was administered.

The Romans received cinnabar, the common ore of mercury,

almost exclusively from the quicksilver mines of Sisapo, the present Almaden (< Arab. *al-má'din*, the mine) N of Cordova, in the latitude of Lisbon. Pliny may have become familiar with the Spanish mines when he was procurator of *Hispania Tarraconensis* in 73 A. D. The crystals of cinnabar, which look like rubies, having a bright red color and adamantine lustre, are called by Pliny *chrysolites*, and he says the best are those which, when brought in contact with gold, make it white like silver: *optumae sunt quae in conlatione aurum albicare quadam argenti facie cogunt*. Cinnabar contains 87% of mercury. ⚗ uses *chrysolites* for the Biblical stones of *Tarshish*, and *Tarshish* appears in Latin as *Tartessus*. Plato's *Atlantis* represents the same region. The dawn of civilization in southwestern Spain may antedate the earliest monuments of Egypt and Babylonia. There may have been sea-traffic between Spain and Crete in the fourth pre-Christian millennium (JAOS 43, 126⁴. 163, b; contrast OLZ 26, 370⁴).

Mercury may have been used in Spain for medicinal purposes at that time. It is a mistake to suppose that the so-called *morbis Gallicus* is a comparatively recent disease, first observed about the end of the 15th century. The *treponema pallidum* is perhaps as old as mankind; it resembles the morbid agent of frambœsia which is regarded in OT as a form of leprosy (JAOS 43, 163, c). The disease, with which the hero of the Babylonian Nimrod epic (ZDMG 64, 712, n. 2; OLZ 27, 57^m; 26, 490⁴. 197) was stricken, because he rejected the love of the Babylonian Venus, seems to have been *lues venerea* (see the paper by J. K. Proksch in vol. 12 of Unna's dermatological journal, Hamburg, 1891).

4. The Median Lapis-lazuli Mountain.

Tiglath-pileser IV as well as Sennacherib's father and son, Sargon and Esarhaddon, repeatedly mention a mountain in the remotest region of Media, at the edge of the salt-desert, i. e. the *Dasht-i-Kevîr* of Khorasan. The name of this mountain is *Bikn*, and Esarhaddon (cf. Rost, *Tig.* 106⁴) calls it *šad uknî*, lapis-lazuli mountain. Ass. *uknû*, which has passed into Greek and Latin as *κύανος*, *cyanus* is evidently derived from *Bikn* which may represent an OP *Vikn* (or *Uikn*) just as Arrian has *Βιστάνης* for *Vištâna* which appears in Babylonian as *Uštâna* (JAOS 37,

314'). Similarly the name of the father of Darius I, Hystaspes, is in OP: *Vištâspa*, Babyl. *Uštâspa* (cf. Lith. *udra* = Pol. *wydra*, otter; see above, n. 5).

Viknite is a name like *malachite* < *Meluxa*, the Sumerian name of Nubia (JEA 7, 83). The cuneiform name for *malachite* (Sum. *guk*, Ass. *sându* = *šaḥamatu*, Heb. *šôh^am*) means prop. *black*, Arab. *ášḥamu*; myrtle and ivy are called in Latin: *niger* (cf. also Arab. *ádham* and *ḡiml*). Ass. *sându* was used not only for *malachite*, but also for *fluorite*, jade, serpentine, and other green ornamental stones (cf. Lat. *smaragdus*). Similarly Ass. *uknû* denoted not only *lapis lazuli*, but also *sapphire* and *turquoise*. The special name for *turquoise* is *uknû ebbu* (= Syr. *ḥēbīb*) or *banû* (= Eth. *bērûh*, Arab. *bâhir*; cf. JAOS 44, 168, l. 6) i. e. *light viknite*.

The Assyrians received their lapis lazuli from Badakshan (JHUC 114, 112) but Esarhaddon's lapis-lazuli mountain cannot have been the *Mazar-i-Ilakh* in Badakshan (BL 61) because the Assyrian king states that it was at the border of the salt-desert. Nor can it have been the Damavand, c. 50 m NE of Teheran, because there are no lapis-lazuli or turquoise mines in that region. We must therefore identify the Bikn with the peak *Ali Mirsai* on the southern slopes of which (at an elevation of 5100 feet, NW of the village of *Mâdan* = Arab. *má'dan*, mine, 32 m NW of the home of 'Omar Khayyâm, *Nishapur*) the famous turquoise mines are situated. We know that Esarhaddon invaded Egypt and Nubia, so we need not hesitate to assume that he advanced as far east as Nishapur, c. 500 m E of Teheran. In the reign of Esarhaddon (681-668) the Assyrian dominion extended from Nishapur, near the border of Afghanistan, to Tarshish, W of the Pillars of Hercules, which represents Plato's *Atlantis* (JAOS 43, 126. 163).

Esarhaddon calls the region of Nishapur *Patuš'arra* (= *Patušuâra*; cf. ZA 2, 272; AJP 39, 307⁴; JAOS 43, 122⁵). He carried to Assyria two local chieftains, *Šitirparna*⁶ and *Eparna*. Three other chieftains, *Uppis* of *Partakka*, *Sanasana*⁷ of *Partukka*, and *Ramatea* of *Urakazabarna*, paid tribute in Nineveh. These Iranian names are 150 years older than the Achæmenian

⁵ Ass. *š* was pronounced *s*, and *s*:*š* (JAOS 43, 126⁴; OLZ 27, 24^m; JSOR 8, 52⁴).

inscriptions. We have also the names of 23 Median chiefs, with their capitals, who paid tribute to Esarhaddon's grandfather, Sargon, in 713 B. C. (VHKO 234; Delitzsch, *Kossäer* 48).

Partukka has been identified with *Parætacene* which is connected with Skt. *párvatas*, mountain, rock; but this name was given to a number of districts in Media.

Patuš'arra has been combined with Πατεωχορεῖς in which *ε* represents *i* (AJP 39, 309). In the trilingual inscription of Darius Hystaspis at *Naqš-i-Rustam* (two hours N of Persepolis) Darius' lance-bearer Gobryas (OP *Gau̯baruua*, Bab. *Kubarra*, i. e. *Gûbâra* or *Gôbâra*)¹⁰ is called a *Patischorian*. This name appears in the OP text as *Pâtis̥uuaris̥* (for *Pâtis̥xuâris̥*).¹¹ The *x* before *u* is elided. In modern Persian, on the other hand, the *u* in *xuâ* is not pronounced, while *xuâ* becomes *xo*, *xu*. Strabo's Πατεωχορεῖς shows that this pronunciation may have obtained at the beginning of the Christian era. The diphthong *au*, for which we find *û* in modern Persian, must have been pronounced *ô* in OP. Babyl. *Paiddis̥xuriš* shows that OP *pâti* was pronounced *paidi*, with epenthesis of the *i*, which we find in Avestan (JAOS 44, 158, d). The later form of this name is *Pâdis̥xuâr* which means *over against* or *in front of Khuâr* (the modern *Khâr*) i. e. the ancient *Choara* (or *Choarene*) which Pliny (6, 44) calls *Parthiae amoenissimus situs*. It was the region on the southern slopes of the Elburz range down to the salt-desert (ZA 12, 56). *Pâdi*, in front of,¹² may signify *east of*, just as Heb. *qidmât* has this meaning: *front* denotes *east*; *back*: *west*; *right*: *south*; *left*: *north*.

5. Salvation and Redemption.

We call Christ our Savior and Redeemer. He is supposed to have suffered for our salvation, His passion being accepted as a substitute for the punishment which men deserved. The early Fathers held that Christ paid a ransom to Satan to induce him to release men from his power (EB¹¹ 2, 876^a). According to the famous treatise *Cur Deus homo* by the founder of scholastic theology, St. Anselm, who died as archbishop of Canterbury in

¹⁰ Cf. above, note 6.

¹¹ Cf. Brugmann's *Grundriss*¹ 2, 264.

¹² Cf. Lagarde, *Beitr. z. baktr. Lexikographie* (1868) p. 51.

1109, Christ's voluntary passion appeased God's justice demanding satisfaction for the sins which wounded His honor (EB¹¹ 2, 83^a). One of the heretical theses of the *troubadour among the scholastics*, Héloïse's lover, Abelard, who died in 1142, was: *Quod Christus non assumpsit carnem ut nos a iugo diaboli liberaret*. St. Anselm was born in northwestern Italy, while Abelard, the boldest thinker of the 12th century, was a native of Brittany which was not incorporated with France before 1532. According to Abelard, Christ's passion arouses in us love which frees us from the bondage of sin, thus enabling us to fulfil the law and the will of God, not out of fear, but as children of God. The atonement is based on personal union with Christ (RE³ 1, 25, ll. 3. 18). Similar views are held by modern Unitarian theologians who have accepted the results of the comparative study of religions. Practical religion is summed up in love to God, and love to man (EB¹¹ 27, 596).

The doctrine of vicarious atonement is based on the poem in Is. 52, 12-53, 13. In Matt. 8, 17 the line *Surely, he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows* is taken to mean that Christ healed all that were sick, but the Hebrew original cannot have this meaning. Nor is the generally accepted interpretation correct that Christ endured the sufferings and pains which we deserved. *Our sufferings and our pains* means *the pains and sufferings we inflicted* on the Servant of the Lord, i. e. a collective term for the faithful Jews at the beginning of the Maccabean period (c. 170 B. C.).¹³ The proselytes, i. e. the heathen converted to Judaism after the Maccabean victories, say: It was our fault that Judah was mangled, but the chastisement which Judas Maccabæus and his successors inflicted on us had a salutary effect;¹⁴ when they beat us we were cured: our eyes were opened, and we saw that Judaism was the only true religion, and JHVH the only true God (2 Mac. 7, 37).

This is the meaning of the hemistich *with his stripes we are healed*. The preceding hemistich, which appears in G as

¹³ Cf. E. B. Pusey, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters* (Oxford, 1877) pp. 37. 117. 275. 314. 564; also Lagarde, *Symmicta* 2, 13; contrast Gunkel, *Ein Vorläufer Jesu* (Bern, 1921) pp. 5. 18. 24; see also OLZ 25, 173; 27, 83.

¹⁴ We must read: *u-mûsarô li-šlôménû 'alânû*.

ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν (Ξ *vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras*) cannot mean: *He was wounded* (in vicarious suffering) *for our transgressions*; ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τοῦτον means *It was this man's fault that he was wounded*, just as we can say *Διὰ τοῦτον τὰ πράγματα οὕτω κακῶς διάκειται*, *It is this man's fault that the situation is so bad*. Ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τούτου (*vulneratus est per eum*) would imply that this man wounded him with his own hand. *It is my fault* is in Hebrew: *bî hä-'auôn* (cf. 1 S 25, 24) and in Arabic: *húya dâmbî* or *ad-dâmbu 'alâiia*. In the same way we find in Latin: *mea culpa* or *meum vitium est* (JAOS 44, 157, b). If the theologians knew a little more Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the development of Christianity might have been different. The existence of so many different denominations shows that the Bible is misinterpreted (JHUC 163, 51^b).

The poem in Is. 52, 13-53, 9 consists of five pentastichs with 3 + 3 beats in each line. The last two stanzas must be transposed. The following three verses (Is. 53, 10-12) contain nothing but a jumble of misplaced glosses. The Hebrew text, with translation and explanatory notes, will be published elsewhere.

6. Threescore and ten.

The so-called *Prayer of Moses, the Man of God* (which may have been composed c. 100 B. C.) says:

Our years are threescore and ten, and, if one be strong, even fourscore;
Yet most of them: labor and sorrow, for nought we are toiling and moiling.

We must read: *nîgâ' hinnám uē-nî'āpâ* (JBL 31, 122). In German you say of a septuagenarian: *Er hat das Alter des Psalmisten* (or *das Psalmistenalter*) *erreicht*. A hundred years ago, when Goethe was 74 years old, he said (on Jan. 27, 1824) to his friend Eckermann (who, eight years later, became his literary executor): *Man hat mich immer als einen vom Glück besonders Begünstigten gepriesen . . . allein im Grunde ist es nichts als Mühe und Arbeit gewesen*. In the second part of *Faust* (8313) Proteus says: *Das Erdentreiben, wie's auch sei, ist immer doch nur Plackerei*. In Gustav Schwab's poem *Das Gewitter* the grandmother says: *Das Leben ist Sorg' und viel Arbeit*.

Threescore and ten is an English idiom; the Hebrew original of Ps. 90, 10 as well as the ancient versions have the common numeral for 70. All the early English Bibles preceding AV have *threescore and ten*, only the Wyclifite versions, which were made from \mathfrak{J} , use *seventy*, but the Wyclif Bible of 1388 has *threescore and ten* in Lev. 12, 5.

Score for a group of 20 (cf. Fr. *une vingtaine d'années* and *quatre-vingts* for *octante*) is recorded as early as 1100. The original meaning is *notch*: in counting sheep or cattle from 1 to 20 it was customary to make a notch on a stick before proceeding to count the next 20 (OD). In archery, *score* signified 20 yards; in Ireland and western England it denoted 20 lbs. In German, *Stein* is used in the same sense, whereas in England *stone* = 14 lbs. For 20 pieces you can say in German: *Steige* (or *Stiege*): in Hesse-Cassel you ask for *eine Steige Eier*, i. e. 20 eggs, but in Silesia you buy *eine Mandel Eier*, i. e. 15. Ger. *Schock* denotes 60 = 3 *Steigen* or 4 *Mandeln*. The original meaning is a *shock* of sheaves or grain. In New England these sheaves gathered in piles are called *stooks* which is connected with Ger. *Stauche*, bundle of flax. New England *stooks* generally consist of 12 sheaves. Ger. *Mandel*, which signifies also a *shock* of 15 sheaves, is a dialectic diminutive of *Mann*, man (contrast Grimm 6, 1535, l. 6). *Männchen machen*, said of a hare, means *to sit erect*; it is used also of a rearing horse. A shock of sheaves is called in German not only *Mandel*, but also *Puppe*, puppet. Luther has *Mandel* for AV *heap of corn* (Heb. *'āremā*) in Ruth 3, 7 and for AV *shock* (Heb. *gadîš*) in Judg. 15, 5 (cf. also the mistranslations in Ez. 3, 5; Is. 17, 11; Hos. 12, 12). In Palestine the sheaves were not set up as shocks (DB 1, 50; EB 81).

Shock has originally the meaning of Ger. *Stoss* (e. g. *Holzstoss*, pile of wood) < *stossen*, to push, thrust (cf. Fr. *choquer*, *choc*) just as Ger. *Schober* (e. g. *Heuschober*, haycock) is connected with *schieben*, to shove > *sheaf* and *shovel*, Ger. *Schaufel*. Similarly *pile*, heap, must be combined with Lat. *pilum*, pestle, Ger. *Stössel*; cf. also *stack*, *stake*, *stick*, Ger. *Stock* (in *Heustock* = *Heuschober*, *Garbenstock*, &c.) and *Staken*, *stecken*, *stechen*. Also Ger. *Stauche* (see preceding paragraph) < *stauchen* = *stossen* (cf. *er stauchte sein Pferd in die Flanke*). Ger. *verstauchen* and its English equivalent *sprain* (< *exprimere*)

meant orig. *to press, push* (cf. Fr. *se fouler le bras* and *foule*, crowd, throng, multitude). Lat. *pilus*, maniple of the *triarii* (or *pilani*) means orig. *heap*, while Lat. *pilum*, javelin, is a spear thrown with a sudden *thrust* (cf. *hastam jacere*, ἀφιέναι τὴν λόγχην).

The Hebrews regarded an octogenarian as a dotard: the Gileadite Barzillai answered David, when the king invited him to follow him to Jerusalem (2 S 19, 36): I am this day fourscore years old, and can I discern between good and evil? *i. e.* I am in my second childhood. Not to know good and evil (*i. e.* not to be capable of discerning between right and wrong) means *to be like a child* (cf. *Odyss.* 18, 228). The fall of man symbolizes the first sexual intercourse. Schopenhauer (*Parerga* 2, § 167) says: *Illico post coitum cachinnus auditur Diaboli*. He who eats of the forbidden fruit loses his childlike innocence, just as Adam and Eve perceived that they were naked (PAPS 50, 505; 60, 86; JHUC 316, 24). They were told by the Serpent (symbolizing concupiscence) that they would be like God, *i. e.* capable of producing human beings: they would become *under-makers* (CD 4581^m). After the birth of Cain, Eve exclaims: I have produced a man as well as JHVH (*Mic.* 63; JBL 36, 142.)¹⁵

The average duration of life has increased with civilization, and this is chiefly due to temperance in eating and drinking. Fifty years ago a woman of 30 was regarded as *passée*, now *la femme de quarante ans* plays an important part in novelistic and dramatic literatures.¹⁶ The Romans called a man over 60 *senex*.¹⁷ A modern sexagenarian need not be senile.¹⁸ The

¹⁵ Dorothy Dix (Mrs. G. O. Gilmer) says: The woman who bears a child shares with God the great thrill of creation (*Baltimore Sun*, July 16, 1924, p. 6, col. 7).

¹⁶ An advertisement in SEP, June 24, 1924, p. 139 states: In India a woman of 20 is aging, at 25 she is old. American women are now young at 40. Labor-saving devices, laundries, &c. have freed her from youth-destroying tasks. In seven years a washday a week mounts up to a year of washdays. American women are living youth when the women of India are remembering it.

¹⁷ According to the laws of Ceos (Strabo 486) sexagenarians were to be *oslerized*: hemlock was to be administered to them.

¹⁸ The Vice-President of the English Royal College of Surgeons, Sir

years 1-20 represent now spring; 20-45 (*ἡλικία*, *juventus*): summer; 45-75: fall; 75-90: winter. A *lusty winter* is, to a certain extent, a personal merit. We must, of course, be careful in the selection of our parents, but a young giant may ruin his health for ever in a few minutes, while a delicate child may develop into an athlete.

7. The Hittite Name of Troy.

Even after Schliemann's explorations at Hissarlik (1870-1873) many scholars doubted that the Homeric Troy ever existed. The keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, D. G. Hogarth says at the end of his article on Schliemann (EB¹¹ 24, 341) that after Schliemann's death (1890) Dörpfeld's excavations at Hissarlik proved the identity of the sixth stratum with Homer's Troy, *if Troy ever was*. Now the editor of the cuneiform texts from the royal archives of the ancient Hittite capital at Boghazkeui (c. 100 m E of the new Turkish capital Angora which is c. 220 m by rail ESE of Constantinople) Dr. Emil Forrer, of Berlin, who has examined c. 11,000 clay tablets and fragments, has found (MDOG 63, 7) the Hittite name of Troy, written *Ta-ru-i-ša*, representing an ancient Gr. *Τρώϊσα* which became, with elision of the intervocalic *s*, *Τρώϊα*, *Τροία*, just as the Eolic form of *ἔως*, dawn, *αὔως* < *αὔσως* which appears in Latin as *aurora* < *ausosa*. The *s* is preserved in our *East*, the region of dawn (cf. Juvenal 10, 1) and *Easter*, the dawn of the year.

These texts give also the name of Agamemnon's father who, according to the Hittite annals, must have reigned over Achaia (Hitt. *Axxiiaua* < *Axxaiiua*; cf. Lat. *Achivi*) c. 1225, while Troy is supposed to have been destroyed, after a ten year's siege by the confederated Achaeans under the lead of Agamemnon, in 1184. Dr. Forrer (OLZ 27, 118) thinks that *Ἀτρεΐς* may not

D'Arcy Power, remarked in Baltimore (on April 16, 1924) that nowadays a man was no longer old at 70, and the average life of a human being would increase further. In the 16th century a man of 50 was considered an old man, and a man of 60 was thought to be exceptionally old. Many people died of apoplexy in the 19th century, while deaths from this cause to-day were comparatively few. The expectation of long life had greatly increased within the last few years (Baltimore *Sun*, April 17, 1924, p. 11, cols. 2. 3).

be Greek, but I believe this name is identical with the adjective *ἀτρεΰς*, unshakable, intrepid. Hitt. *Attarissijas* (< *Attaristijas* < *Atristijas*) may represent *ἀτρεστος*. He is called a *ku-ri-e-ua-ni-eš* (also written *kuiruanas*) = *κοίρανος* (cf. *Il.* 2, 204). The Hittite renderings of Greek names and words are at least as accurate as the Talmudic *Ābîrûdêmôs* (or *Āurîdêmôs*, not *Uardîmôs*) < *Εὐρύδημος*, *Āṣarbôlîs* < *Τρίπολις*, *Aṣrâkônâ* < *Τράχων*, *ăġîstôn* (or *ăġîstē'ôn*, *ăġîstēuôn*) < *ἐκζητῶν*, *dēiôplôstôn* < *διπλόστων*, *dēiôprôsôpîn* (or *dēiôparçûpîn*) < *διπρόσωπος* (cf. *AJP* 39, 308, l. 5).

The name of the citadel of Troy, *Πέργαμος*, is connected with *πύργος*, tower, Ger. *Burg*. The Turkish designation of the site of Troy is *Hissarlik*, fortification (< Arab. *hiṣār*, with abstract, not diminutive, suffix). *Τρωῖσα* (> *Τροία*) may be connected (contrast *Pauly*² 9, 1064, 49; 6, 730, 41) both with *τύρσις*, tower (which may denote a fortress like the Tower of London) and with *Τυρσηνοί*, the Greek name of the Etruscans whom the Romans called *Tusci* (> *Tuscany*). In Umbrian *Turskum numen* (= *Tuscum nomen*) the *r* is preserved. In the cuneiform script, *Τρωῖσα* must be written either *Ta-ru-i-ša* or *It-ru-i-ša* which would explain *Etruria* (for *š* = *s* and *u* = *o* see above, nn. 9. 6).

Greek historians regarded Rome as a Tyrrhenian city, and Roman poets call the Tiber a Tuscan river. Many of the early Roman names are Etruscan.¹⁹ Rome was ruled for some time by Etruscan kings. The ancestral hero of the Romans is the Trojan prince *Æneas*. The Roman patricians (cf. *JAOS* 42, 374¹) were Etruscans, not Sabines, and the plebeians: Latins, but the Asiatic invaders adopted the language of Latium, just as the Hebrews (and the Phenicians who came from the *Ægean*) adopted the language of Canaan (*JHUC* 306, 22¹).

The romance of *Æneas* and *Dido* (a surname of the tutelary deity of Carthage) reflects an ancient alliance between Etruria and Carthage, which was afterwards broken. The destruction of Troy was not due to the rape of Helen,²⁰ but to the rape of

¹⁹ Cf. Wilhelm Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904) p. 580 (Transactions of the Royal Society of Göttingen, vol. 5, part 2).

²⁰ The statement (published in a great many newspapers, e. g. *The*

Hellenes: Trojan piracy in the Dardanelles interfered with Greek commerce (cf. JAOS 34, 419⁴). The name *Dardanelles* is derived from Æneas' home *Dardanus* on the Hellespont, and Latin poets occasionally call the Romans *Dardani*. Πόντος in Ἑλλάσποντος means orig. *path*; cf. Lat. *pons* and πόροι ἁλός (*Od.* 12, 259). Ἑλλη may be a name like Φοινίκη, Θράκη, Κρήτη, and it may be connected with ἔλος, meadow-land (*Il.* 20, 221; cf. Strabo 328) just as the primary connotation of *Italia* (Osc. *Viteliu*) is pasture-land (EB¹¹ 15, 25^b) < *vitulus*, calf, colt (= ἰταλός, prop. *yearling*; cf. ἔτος, JHUC 348, 49, Apr. 24). *Italia* denoted originally ancient Calabria (not modern Calabria, the toe of the boot) i. e. the *heel* (NE of the Gulf of Taranto) which ends in the Iapygian promontory (Cape Santa Maria di Leuca) c. 30 m SE of Otranto. Strabo (281^s) calls this region εὐβοτος (cf. 228: ἅπασα ἡ Ἰταλία θρεμμάτων τε ἀρίστη τροφὸς καὶ καρπῶν ἐστίν. There are vast herds of cattle in Italy and enormous flocks of sheep. Pasture occupies about one-third of the total area of the country.

Hellas was originally the name of the home of Achilles, *Phthia* in southern Thessaly, N of the Maliac Gulf, near the northern extremity of Eubœa < εὐβοσία, good pasturage (*Il.* 2, 683; Thuc. 1, 3; cf. EB¹¹ 26, 843⁴). Also *Phthia* may denote *feeding*, pasture-land; cf. *phthisis* (or φθόγη) consumption, and the Horatian (*Ep.* 1, 2, 27) *fruges consumere nati*. The Greeks were nomads when they invaded the Balkan Peninsula. More than one half of the cultivable area of modern Greece is devoted to pasturage (EB¹¹ 12, 435^{bm}). According to Aristotle, the original home of the Hellenes was not southern Thessaly, but Epirus (i. e. southern Albania) which was celebrated for its cattle and its horses. The priests of the most ancient Hellenic sanctuary Dodona were called Ἑλλοι = Σέλλοι (*Il.* 2, 233; 16, 234). According to Hesychius, Σέλλοι = Ἑλληνες οἱ ἐν Δωδώνῃ καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς (for καί see *Pur.* 16). We use *pastor* for *minister*, clergyman.

In the annals of the Hittite king Morsilis (1337-1312) the name of the old king of Orchomenos, Eteocles (< Ἑτεροκλέης)

Sun, Baltimore, June 29, 1924, Magazine Section, p. 2) that Professor Breasted, of Chicago, had found in the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amon a manuscript relating to Helen of Troy, is erroneous.

appears as *Tauagalauas*; the initial vowel is dropped as in Arab. *Taliânî*, Italian, or in Ass. *Sir'ilâ'a*, Israelite (JBL 37, 224') and the *k* is partially assimilated to the *l*, as it is in the Biblical *Tiglath-pileser* < Ass. *Tukulti-bal-ešarra* (see above, p. 239). *Tauag(a)lauas* is called *Aialauas*, an Eolian, *Aἰολος* < *Aἰφολος*. In Eolic, particularly in Boeotian and Lesbian, the *φ* was persistent. Eteocles is said to have instituted the worship of the Graces; in Theocritus' idyls (16, 104) the Charites are apostrophized: ὦ Ἑτεόκλειοι θυγατρὲς. The Hittite king addresses Eteocles *my brother*, a distinction which is bestowed only on the kings of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria;²¹ so Eteocles must have been a great king like Agamemnon; but as ruler of his colony in Pamphylia (N of Cyprus) he was vassal of the Hittite king, just as George I was king of Great Britain and Ireland as well as elector of Hanover. The name of the father of Eteocles of Orchomenos, Ἀνδρεύς, who was king of *Axxiaua*, Achaia, and *Lazpa*, Lesbos, c. 1340, is given as *Ant(a)rauas*; the *t* after *n* may have been pronounced *d* as in modern Greek (see above, p. 240). Boeotia continued to be the real centre of Greece down to the Homeric age; the Achaean expedition against Troy started from the Boeotian harbor of Aulis (opposite Chalcis at the *Eὔριπος*, the narrowest point of the Euboeic Sea) although the commander-in-chief, Agamemnon, was king of Mycenae in Argolis. The catalog of ships (*Il.* 2, 495) begins with Boeotia. The present population of Boeotia is largely Albanian as it is also in southern Euboea.

8. Ascanius and Alba Longa.

Lat. *Tusci*, Etruscans (< *Tursci* = *Τυρσηνοί*; cf. Bibl. *Tiras*, Gen. 10, 2) < *Τρωῖσα* > *Τρωῖα* > *Τροία*. We can hardly assume (EB¹¹ 1, 483^b) that the form *Tyrrhena* is preserved in the Albanian *Tirana*, 20 m E of Durazzo, the ancient Dyrrhachium; cf. the Italian *Tirano* in the Valtellina, near the Swiss frontier, SE of the Piz Bernina in the Upper Engadine. Nor can we accept the derivation of *Tusci* from *θύσκη*, censer < *θύειν* (Plin. 3, 50: *a sacrificio ritu lingua Graecorum Thusci sunt nominati*). The Roman patricians were Etruscans. They took Sabine wives,

²¹ For the Assyrian power in the third and second pre-Christian millennia cf. OLZ 26, 544.

because they refused to intermarry with the subdued Latin population. Connubium between patricians and plebeians was not legalized before 445. Scions of the Roman nobility were called *Trojugenae* (Juvenal 1, 100; 11, 95). The eponymic ancestor of the *Julia gens*, to which Julius Cæsar belonged, was Æneas' son Iulus²² who is called also Ascanius which is a *nomen gentile*. The mother of Rome, Alba Longa, 15 m SE of Rome, near Tusculum, i. e. Little Etruria,²³ is said to have been founded by Ascanius whose name may be connected with the Ascanians in Asia Minor and the Biblical Ashkenaz (DB 1, 166) while the *Albani* of Alba Longa and the other *Albenses populi* (Plin. 3, 69) may be identical, not only with the ancient *Albani* at the southwestern shore of the Caspian Sea, N of Armenia, E of Iberia = Georgia, but also with the modern Albanians on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, S of Montenegro which is now merged in Jugo-Slavia. The width of the Strait of Otranto between Albania and Italy is only c. 40 m. The Greeks call the Albanians 'Αρβανῖται, while the Turkish name is Arnauts (*Arna'út* or *Arna'úd*; Albania: *Arnâ'udlúq*).

The old name of the *Tuscan river* Tiber was *Albula* which cannot mean White River; the Tiber is brown or opaque yellowish gray (Hor. *Od.* 1, 2, 13 calls it *flavus*) not white like the Bavarian Isar. The water of the *Albulae Aquae* (4 m W of Tibur) is bluish. Both Tiber (*Tiberinus*) and Tibur (18 m

²² *Iulus* (or *Ilus*, Verg. *Aen.* 1, 268) must be connected with *Ilium* < Ἰλῦς which may mean *bottom-land*, well-watered region (cf. Gen. 13, 10 and above, p. 48). This is also the meaning of *Damascus* (PAPS 48, 3664). Cf. the remarks on ἔλος, above, p. 254. *Dardania* may be explained in the same way; cf. the Hesychian δαρδαίνειν = μολύνειν and the Platonic ὥσπερ θηρίον ὕειον . . . μολύνεται. *Marsh* means *meadow* in German. The primary connotation of our *sod*, turf, sward, is *sodden*, saturated with water. Ger. *Aue*, meadow, is connected with Lat. *aqua* > Fr. *eau*, λειμών with λίμνη, Fr. *gazon*, sod, turf, greensward = Ger. *Wasen* (> *Rasen*; cf. JAOS 43, 423) = Fr. *vase*, mire = Eng. *oose* (< *woose*). *Turf* is used in Ireland for *peat* (Ger. *Torf*). *Fenlands* may be drained, watery swamps and peat-bogs reclaimed for agricultural purposes. Ger. *Matte*, meadow, is not connected with Lat. *metere*, to mow, but identical with *Matte*, mat: turf and sward (cf. Ger. *Schwarte*, skin) form a kind of mat. For *Julius* < *Ilium* cf. the derivation of *Judaeus* from *Ida*, the central mountain-range of Crete (Tac. *Hist.* 5, 2).

²³ Several of the chief Roman families were of Tusculan origin.

ENE of Rome) recall the *Tibareni* (= the Bibl. *Tubal*, Gen. 10, 2) SE of the Black Sea; cf. the Ebro (Ἰβηρ, Lat. *Iberus*, *Hiberus*) in Spain (contrast the Thracian *Hebrus*, Ἑβρος, i. e. the Maritza) and the Niger in Africa. The name of the Tibur-tine sibyl, at the falls of the Anio which joins the Tiber 3 m N of Rome, was *Albunea* (Hor. *Od.* 1, 7, 12).

The southern Albanians (in Epirus) call themselves *Tosk* (= *Tusci*). They are found also in Greece as well as in southern Italy and Sicily. One-tenth of the population of Greece consists of Albanians. The white plaited petticoat known as *fustanelle*, which has been adopted by the Greek men, is a distinct feature of the Albanian costume. Many of the Albanian women in Greece, even in the neighborhood of Athens, are ignorant of Greek. The view (mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus) that the *Albani* in eastern Caucasia were colonists from Alba Longa is very improbable, but the Iberians (*Hiberi*) in Caucasia (Hor. *Epod.* 5, 20; Tac. *Ann.* 6, 34) may have come over land from Spain, and afterwards Iberian *adventurers* (AJP 45, 63) may have sailed from Spain to the Black Sea, just as there seems to have been, at an early date, sea-traffic between the Pyrenean Peninsula and the British Isles, especially Ireland and Cornwall (cf. above, p. 245; JHUC 348, 49, l. 9; OLZ 26, 370).

Albion (which is generally supposed to mean White Land, with reference to the chalk-cliffs of Dover) was an ancient name of the British Isles (Plin. 4, 102) and Albania is used for Scotland. Basques and Albanians have always been excellent sailors. The success of the Greek War of Independence was mainly due to the fleets of Hydra (4 m off the southeastern coast of Argolis) and the majority of the Hydriotes were Albanians. Both Eteocretans and Pelasgians (Strabo 221; OLZ 27, 178^a) may have belonged to the same race, also the dynastic Egyptians, who founded the kingdoms of Lower and Upper Egypt,²⁴ while the predynastic Egyptians, who may have come from the north-western angle of Africa, it may be supposed, were Semites with an aboriginal negroid admixture (EB¹¹ 9, 43^a; 24, 620^a; 30, 277^b; contrast ZDMG 63, 524, n. 65). The peculiar features

²⁴ Strabo (498ⁱ) speaks of a συγγένειά τις τοῖς Κόλχοις πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. Colchis was at the eastern extremity of the Black Sea, W of Iberia and Albania.

of Egyptian compared with the other Semitic tongues may be due to this Caucasian intrusion. The structural remains of Boghazkeui recall the plans of Cretan palaces in the later Minoan period (EB¹¹ 13, 537^a). The neolithic inhabitants of Ireland (which was not invaded by Celts before 600 or 500 B. C. while Celts settled in Asia Minor in 278/7 B. C.) may have been Iberians. Erin (> Ireland) = *Erinn*, dative of *Eriu* < *Iveriu*, *Iberiu*, Lat. *Hibernia* (Caes. B. G. 5, 13, 2). The early culture of the Iberian Peninsula may antedate the dawn of civilization in Egypt and Babylonia (cf. above, p. 245).

Karl Pauli and Vilhelm Thomsen arrived, independently, at the conclusion that there might be some connection between Etruscan and some of the languages spoken in Caucasia, just as Sumerian is supposed to be related to Georgian.²⁵ In my paper on Crystal-gazing in the OT (JBL 36, 88; cf. JAOS 42, 373) I quoted Hugo Grotius' statement (1644) that he had no doubt the divination described in Ezek. 21, 26 had been transmitted by the Chaldeans to the Lydians, and by them to the Etruscans (cf. OLZ 25, 492). I also called attention to M. v. Niebuhr's remarks on Etruscan and Basque (cf. OLZ 27, 128^m. 178^a).

In Basque the definite article is attached to the end of the word, and we find this postpositive article also in Sumerian as well as in Albanian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian, e. g. Basque *zaldi*, horse; *zaldia*, the horse; *zaldiak*, the horses, which recalls the (non-Aryan) plural ending *-k* or *-q* in Armenian, e. g. *Hay*, Armenian; plur. *Hayq*; Sum. *lugal*, king (prop. *vir magnus*) and *lugal-e*, the king;²⁶ Alban. *kien*, dog; *kien-i*, the dog; Rum. *zi*, day; *ziua*, the day; Bulg. *zhena-ta*, the woman. The suffix article in Albanian, Rumanian, and Bulgarian, is due, it may be supposed, to the influence of the aboriginal (Caucasian) speech of the Balkan Peninsula, and certain non-Aryan peculiarities of Armenian must be explained in the same way (cf. OLZ 25, 145; 26, 565, l. 7; 27, 51, l. 7). Basque *bi*, two; *lau*, four, might be combined with Sum. *min*, two; *limmu* (or *lam-*

²⁵ Cf. Ph. C. Karl Kramář, *Über die sumerisch-gruzinische Spracheinheit* (Prag, 1904) and JRAS, 1910, p. 53; OLZ 27, 176; JAOS 44, 167^m.

²⁶ See SB § 61; Poebel §§ 130. 156. 223. 342. 344.

mu > *lauuu* > *la'u*, *lau*; cf. AJP 39, 307⁴; JAOS 43, 122, l. 7) four. There is a postposition *-ra*, toward, to (cf. AJSL 22, 261) in both Sumerian (OLZ 27, 169⁴) and Basque, and the Basque pronouns *gu*, we; *zu*, ye, may correspond to Sum. *-me*, our; *-zu*, thine. The pronoun for *I* in Sumerian should be read *ga-e* (cf. *ki-gu*, with me, SG § 25, f) not *ma-e* (see CV 37; JAOS 37, 322⁴; cf. Poebel, § 182).²⁷ The affixed *e* is demonstrative like the *e* in *lugal-e*, the king, or the prefixed *an* in Semitic *an-ta*, thou. For Poebel's objection (§ 177) cf. Syr. *lî-hû 'ăbādîôn* (Matt. 25, 40) ye have done it unto *me* (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² § 221).

Herodotus (1, 93) states that Lydian girls gained their dowries by prostitution (like some of the Japanese Geishas) and Plautus (*Cistell.* 2, 3, 19) calls this a Tuscan custom (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4, 55). The *vicus Tuscus* in Rome had a bad reputation. Horace (*Sat.* 2, 3, 228) speaks of the *Tusci turba impia vici*. The Etruscans are said to have come from Lydia to Italy by sea in the 12th century, *i. e.* after the destruction of Troy c. 1184. Of course, there may also have been Etruscans who came from Asia Minor to Italy over land across the Alps. Piacenza, where the famous bronze liver was found in 1877,²⁸ is not far from Milan.

PAUL HAUPT.

²⁷ For Sum. *g* < *u* < *m* (cf. Fr. *gué*, ford = It. *guado* = Lat. *vadum*; Fr. *guède*, woad, *lárîs* = Lat. *vitrum*) see ZDMG 69, 564; ZA 31, 247; JAOS 37, 314⁴. In Old Welsh, initial *w* (*v*) became *gu* (*gw*) in the course of the 9th century (EB¹¹ 5, 618^{b4}).

²⁸ See EB¹¹ 20, 103^{b m}; Pauly³ 6, 727, 28; KAT³ 605, 6; Jastrow, *Rel.* 2, 219; OLZ 26, 493, ll. 4. 8.

III.—ON SOME THEORIES CONCERNING THE COMPOSITION OF THE AENEID.

In our laudable eagerness to gain some knowledge of Vergil's method in writing his Aeneid we are apt, it seems to me, to forget that the poem, even in the unfinished state in which he left it, is a glorious masterpiece of literary art. It follows, therefore, that we have no right to detach a passage or a line from it in order to support any theory of ours concerning the poet's method of work unless we first see whether the passage or the line does not owe its position to the dramatic situation, to the part it plays in the artistic whole.

The contrary practice, however, seems to be the rule in many of the attempts which have been made to determine the relative order of composition of the various books. Even though all the evidence which might bear on this question is open to all men, from it have been drawn the most conflicting conclusions, such, for example, as that the third book is the earliest of all the books, that the third book is the latest,—and Sabbadini at different times held both views,—that the first book preceded the fifth, that the fifth preceded the first, that the seventh book was written in the last year of the poet's life, that the seventh book was written before the third and fifth, and so on. That such conflicting conclusions should be drawn from the same evidence is proof not only that the evidence is not of a convincing character, but that little effort has been made to see whether the passages which are cited in support of this or that theory may not be more simply explained by reference to the poet's art.

Any discussion of this matter of the relation between the books as regards the time of composition, should begin, it seems to me, with the statement in the *Donatus Vita* 23 (34) : *Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII libros, particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem arripiens*; that is, that Vergil first wrote out in prose the matter of his Aeneid and arranged it into twelve books, and that he then began to turn it into verse working by episodes. The fact that the Aeneid, as we have it, with its slight inconsistencies and incomplete lines, is just what would

result from such a method of composition is assurance of the truth of this statement. If we cannot accept it, then no reliance can be placed on any item of information which Suetonius has preserved for us. If we do accept it, it follows that the relation of each book to the others of the twelve, at the time Vergil began to put them into verse, must have been on the whole about as it is now. Minor changes there no doubt were, but any such radical change in the general plan, such, for example, as that postulated by Noack,¹ is unthinkable. It follows, too, that if Vergil worked his prose version into verse by episodes, it is practically impossible for us to tell with any degree of certainty in what order the poetic version of the books was made.

The question arises, then, may not some, at least, of the evidence from which such conflicting conclusions have been drawn, be of such a nature that it can be explained by reference to the poet's artistic sense and to the dramatic economy of the poem? What follows will testify to my own belief, at least, that this question should be answered in the affirmative. It is well to bear in mind the words of Claudius Donatus, *Interpr. Verg. I*, p. 6 (Georgii): Vergilius—non adserentis officio ductus est, sed pro tempore pro persona pro loco pro causa adstruxit ista.

According to Heinze,² whose views must always be received with respect, when Vergil wrote books I, II, IV, VI, his idea was to have the Trojans, even before they left Troy, know both the name of the land to which they were going (cf. IV, 345: sed nunc Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis), and the name of its river (cf. II, 781 sq.: Creusa's shade speaks to Aeneas, Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva / inter . . . fluit—Thybris); that, on the other hand, when he wrote book III, his idea was to have the knowledge of their destination come as a gradual enlightenment. If, then, Vergil had written the third book before the others, there was no reason, thinks Heinze, why he should have given up this plan for one so different that it would have necessitated many

¹ Die Erste Aeneis Vergils, *Herm.* XXVII, 1892, pp. 407 sq.

² Virgils Epische Technik,² p. 87. For opposing views, cf. Karsten, *Herm.* XXXIX, 1904, pp. 259 sq.; Dessau, *Herm.* XL, 1914, pp. 508 sq.

changes in order to bring the third book into harmony with it. If, however, the third book was written after the others, then the reference in these others to a definite end of the wanderings can easily be explained as "vorläufige Versuche."

There are, however, several obstacles in the way of this theory which Heinze himself recognizes but which, after the common fashion of us all when we do not like obstacles to stand in the way of our theories, he tries to avoid in a foot-note. Chief of these obstacles is III, 500, where Aeneas says to Andromache, *si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva / intraro*. This knowledge on the hero's part of the name of the river of his promised land stands, says Heinze, p. 88, n. 1, in direct contrast to the plan of this third book in which nowhere is the Tiber named or Latium, even in the prophecy of Helenus. The line must have been due, therefore, to a slip of the poet (*Versehen des Dichters*), who had not completely freed himself from his earlier idea of having his hero know beforehand the definite name of the place to which he was bound. On the other hand, the definite references in book I (205, 380, 530, 553), book IV (345, 432, where Dido mentions Latium), book VI (67), could not have been due to a slip since, in these books, there is no hint that to Aeneas, "die Lage der neuen Heimat unbekannt sei."

This verse 500 of book III also bothers Miss Crump³ who, following Conrad and Sabbadini, thinks that book III was the earliest of all, the original order of the books having been III, I, II. She is led to this conclusion by the, to her, inferior artistic beauty of III, for she does not see how Vergil, after writing II or IV or VI, could have fallen back to such a low level in III. She disposes of the line by saying that III, 495-505 were a later addition inserted after the end of II was written, III, 495 being a direct reference to II, 780,—and concludes that Vergil thus attempted to harmonize III with II, even though these verses are not in harmony with the rest of III. She finds other discrepancies, also, between III and the other books as follows: that, whereas seven years of wandering are mentioned in I, 755, and V, 626, no definite number is mentioned in III, which gives the impression that a short time has

³ *The Growth of the Aeneid*, Oxford, 1920.

elapsed (this is a tribute, surely, to Vergil's skill somewhat inconsistent with her opinion of III in general); that I, 382, *matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus*, and I, 407-8, *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus?* are not borne out by any reference in III; that, finally, whereas in book I, Venus and Juno play the chief rôles as protectress and enemy respectively of the hero, they are unimportant in III in which, on the other hand, Apollo stands in the forefront. Hence, in her opinion, I, 1-33 were added after I and II were written and after III was put in the place it now occupies.

In this matter of the part which the gods play in these books Heinze, too, finds a discrepancy. He does not think, however, that this discrepancy is evidence of a change of plan on the poet's part, or that Vergil felt any discrepancy. In writing I, 1-33, Vergil was imitating the prooemion of the *Odyssey*, and since, when writing III, no opportunity presented itself for a display of Juno's enmity, he could justify his procedure by Homer's example in the case of Odysseus,⁴ whose sufferings were due to the anger of Poseidon but who, even if he was conscious of this fact, makes no mention of it. That Vergil had this parallel in mind is shown, thinks Heinze, by Helenus' words in III, 435 sq.: *unum illud tibi, nate dea, proque omnibus unum / praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque monebo: / Iunonis magnae primum prece numen adora, / Iunoni cane vota libens dominamque potentem / supplicibus supera donis*. These words are modelled, says Heinze, on the words of Teiresias to Odysseus in *λ*, 100 sq.; in both passages there is a warning for the future and no reference is made to the effect of the god's wrath in the past. So Venus also remains in the background throughout III, and there is nothing in Aeneas' narrative to Dido to show that during the greater part of his voyage he received any aid or comfort from her. In this regard Vergil, he thinks,

⁴ The ways of criticism are strange! Whereas Heinze tries to explain what he considers inconsistencies in III by Homer's practice in the *Odyssey*, Noack, who agrees with him in regard to the time of composition of III, finds very few reminiscences of the *Odyssey* in III but many of the *Iliad*.

when he wrote I, had planned differently, as is shown by Aeneas' words to Venus in I, 382 and 407 (quoted above). These lines, however, do not imply necessarily that the poet was working with any definite plan in mind, since here again Vergil could justify himself by the analogy of Homer's treatment of Athena in the *Odyssey*. Hence he is inclined to see in the *falsis imaginibus* of I, 407, a reminiscence of Athena's shape-shiftings in her dealings with Odysseus. The reproach contained in the line is, however, meaningless in the light of the fully developed plan of III, and had Vergil lived to revise his poem he would, Heinze thinks, have probably corrected the lack of reference.

These passages from Heinze and Miss Crump I have cited because they furnish the chief support for their conclusions regarding the relation of book III to the others of the first six. The fact that their conclusions are diametrically opposed is justification, it seems to me, for this attempt to consider the lines which they quote from the *Aeneid* in the light of Vergil's artistic conception and purpose.

Let us turn first to lines 1-33 of book I. Miss Crump considers the connection between them and line 34 more abrupt than would have been the case had Vergil written them at, so to speak, one sitting. She concludes, therefore, as we have seen, that they were written after the rest of I was composed, at the time when Vergil decided to make I the new first book instead of III which stood originally in the first place. Heinze considers the lines as a prooemion written in imitation of the prooemion of the *Odyssey* without definite thought how the details which were to follow would correspond to it. Noack sees two prooemia; lines 1-7 are the prooemion to the entire twelve books. The first draft of the poem, however, consisting of books I, II, IV, VI, which Vergil wrote under the influence of the *Odyssey*, may well have begun with line 8, *Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso*, with which he compares *Ody. α, 1: Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα*.

Such ideas as these of Heinze and Noack are an illustration of a fault common to criticism of Vergil since the time of Macrobius and Servius, namely, that of assuming that, because Vergil wrote an epic, he wrote an Homeric epic. This is the fault into

which Professor Bassett falls, when he criticizes⁵ the beginning of the Aeneid as an "over-elaboration," and says that Vergil, by introducing the reasons for Juno's wrath "artlessly explains the cause of the wanderings and hardships of his hero before he begins to tell the story," that is, according to him, at line 34. No one, of course, will deny that Vergil employs the machinery of Homer, and that in writing the prooemion to book I there came into his mind the opening lines not only of the Odyssey but also of the Iliad. It does not follow, however, that Vergil wrote, in the sense that Homer wrote, the narrative of "the wanderings and hardships" of one hero only, for he did not. What Vergil wrote was the epic, or rather the drama, of a great people, of the genus *Latinum / Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae* (?), of which that hero was the founder. What, one may ask, has this in common with Homer? In the history of that people one event stood out above all others, an event to which they owed in part their greatness and their place in the world, the long, bitter, but triumphant struggle with Carthage. From the beginning of that struggle the Romans realized its meaning, and the fancy of the people, no less than the fancy of poets, saw in it the reflexion of a struggle between divine forces, between Juno, the enemy of the Trojans and their descendants, the Romans, and patron goddess of Carthage, Rome's great enemy, and Venus and Jupiter representing the divine will that from the Trojans, *populum late regem belloque superbum / venturum excidio Libyae*. So Naevius and so Ennius had visualized the struggle,⁶ and Horace quickened the old idea into new life by his glorious third ode of book III. Hence it is that Vergil ends his prooemion with a prayer to the Muse to tell him the reasons for Juno's wrath (8-12); hence his narrative begins not with line 34 but with line 12, with the name of Carthage, the city of Juno's love, which she had planned, *si qua fata sinant*, to make the capitol of the world; hence the reference in line 20 to the glory of Rome that was to be, and to those (not one hero only, Aeneas is not mentioned in lines 12-33), the

⁵ The Proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey, A. J. P. XLIV, 1923, p. 339, n. 1, and p. 344.

⁶ Cf. Macr. S. VI, 2, 31; Serv. ad Aen. I, 20.

reliquiae Danaum atque inmitis Achillis, who, in spite of the hostility of Juno, were to make that glory possible. There is, therefore, no break between lines 33-4; Juno is still the real subject, and the narrative of her position as patron goddess of Carthage and of her hatred of the Trojans (not of one hero only) is continued dramatically by her soliloquy, 36 sq., which introduces the great drama of the gods' part in the destiny of Rome. Juno is successful in her first attempt to hinder the fulfillment of that destiny; the storm falls upon the deep and the happiness with which the band of Trojans had left Sicily (35) is turned to tears. And then, in this dark hour for the mortal actors in the drama, who cannot know or understand their lot, we are carried up into heaven where Jupiter unfolds to the sorrowing mother-goddess the glorious destiny, not of her son only, but of his descendants, and announces Juno's renunciation of her wrath (280) to join with him in favoring Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam (282), until the culmination of their glory in the reign of peace and law under Augustus. Again we may ask, what has this in common with Homer? Or what right have we to judge Vergil's epic drama from the point of view of Homer's epic narrative, Vergil's conception by Homer's?

The opening lines of the Aeneid, therefore, far from having been written under the domination of Homer's prooemia, far from being a mere over-elaboration, an artless explanation of the causes of the hero's hardships, far from being an abrupt introduction written under the compulsion of a change of plan, have nothing, save a phrase or two, in common with Homer's prooemia; they contain no more and no less than is needed to indicate, by a surpassing artistry, the poet's conception of his whole, and they stand in the most intimate connection with that whole as well as with the lines immediately following them.

In the first book also are two other lines which loom large in the arguments of Heinze and Miss Crump; I, 382: *matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus*, and 407, *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus?* To Heinze, since in III there is nothing *in Aeneas' narrative* (the italics are mine) to show that during the greater part of his

wandering, he had received any aid or comfort from Venus, and no reference is made to even one *falsa imago*, this is evidence that Vergil had planned when writing book I to make Venus play a leading rôle, but gave up Venus for Apollo when writing book III. Miss Crump likewise thinks the lines are inconsistent with book III, but her conclusion from this (assumed) inconsistency is, that Vergil neglected to make the details in I correspond with the matter in the earlier III.

Let us notice, first, the relation between these lines and the immediate context. Venus, after hearing from Jupiter the *fatum Romanum* must, in the joy of her heart, see her son, must with her own lips assure him of the safety of his companions and of an hospitable reception by Dido, the queen of the land to which he has come, a queen who, like Aeneas, as Venus is careful to tell him, had been a wanderer and an outcast but, unlike Aeneas, has found a home and peace. I need not pause here to emphasize the irony of this situation,—a mother, and the protecting divinity of the Roman people, leading her son, the ancestor of that people, into a situation which was to bring about his own moral undoing and to cause a century of woe to Rome. This irony, however, if nothing else, would justify the bitterness and the pathos of Aeneas' reply to his mother's question as to his identity, *sum pius Aeneas—conscendi navibus aequor / matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus*. No wonder his goddess-mother could suffer him to say no more; no wonder that her love prompted her to reveal herself, if but for a moment, to him; no wonder that her heart-sick son, whose hopes had again been mocked, should cry out as she turned from him, *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus?* From the point of view of poetry what could surpass these lines? They are in perfect harmony with the situation of the characters involved, they are true from the point of view of art, even if Venus had never before this moment showed herself to her suffering son. That was enough for the poet who wrote them, even if it does not satisfy his critics who think that he should have given a cross reference to some other book of his poem, or to the *Odyssey*.

Are these lines (382, 407), however, inconsistent with anything in the other books? In regard to 382, it is to be noted

that Aeneas does not say to Venus, "my mother led me during all my wanderings," but simply, "I set sail with my mother pointing out my way, following prophecies of the gods." Servius may have been right in seeing in this line a reference to the tradition that Venus' star did guide the Trojans, and Vergil may have had the tradition in mind again when he wrote II, 801, where Aeneas and his followers are making ready to set sail: *iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idae / ducebatque diem*; the *fata* may be those referred to in III, 363, IV, 345. However this may be, could Vergil make Aeneas in book III tell Dido that his goddess-mother was his guide and protector during his wanderings when these had meant nothing but suffering and "hopes deferred?" Or, again, how could he tell her that his mother had mocked him by showing herself now and then and, as far as he knew, without aiding him in his moments of dire distress? What a mother and what a guide! Surely in Aeneas' *own narrative to Dido* there was no place for Venus, and we have no right to cite omissions and insertions, which are absolutely essential from the artistic standpoint, as evidence for any theory for the priority of this or that book.

What is true of Venus' absence from book III is true, also, of Juno's. "Strange," cry the critics, "that Vergil should have made Juno so prominent in book I and then have left her out of III! He must have been imitating Homer, or else changed his plan." But is it strange? Although Aeneas knows that Juno had been the enemy of Troy,—the vision of her pitiless figure had been vouchsafed him when his city fell,—he did not know, as far, at least, as the poem tells us, that her enmity was still pursuing the Trojans any more than he knew that in the distant day of Rome's future she would join with Jupiter in favoring his descendants. But even if Aeneas had known, how could he have told Dido? Remember the situation. When Aeneas enters Dido's rising city, the first sight which meets his gaze is the splendid temple which the queen is building in honor of her patron goddess, Juno. On its walls he sees pictured by a sympathetic hand the story of his people's sufferings and the cruelty of their conquerors: *hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem / ausus et adflictis melius confidere rebus* (I, 451-2). In the light of the opening lines of the poem and of Rome's rela-

tion to Carthage the masterly irony of this whole passage is apparent. To this temple comes the radiant Dido, happy in her task of establishing her new city, and at its doors she seats herself upon her throne; here it is that she receives the shipwrecked Trojans and with generous sympathy extends to them her all. And later, when Tyrians and Trojans crowd the banquet hall and "ancestral ceremonies are kindled into life," it is the queen who prays, 730 sq.: Iuppiter—hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis / esse velis nostrosque huius meminisse minores (again note the irony); adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator et bona Iuno.

Surely in the light of this relationship between Dido and Juno, a relationship which Vergil is so careful to emphasize both here and, by implication, in the opening lines of the poem, it was impossible for him from the point of view of his art, to say nothing of that of good taste, to have made Aeneas, even if he was conscious of Juno's hostility, set forth that fact to Dido. Had he done so there could have been, as far as poetic art is concerned, no story. For, if Dido had known of Juno's undying hatred of the Trojans, or if Aeneas had known of Juno's purpose to make Carthage mistress of the world, there could have been no problem of the conflict of human loves with the divine will which Vergil makes the subject of his fourth book. And yet Vergil has succeeded in reminding us in book III of Juno's position and in a way that is most impressive and in entire harmony with the dramatic situation. Aeneas quotes to Dido the prophecy of Helenus—a Trojan, note, one who, just as other Trojans, has suffered from the hostility of Juno. The very climax of his prophecy, however, is a solemn warning to Aeneas (435 sq.), that he must pay homage to the power of Juno, must make his prayers to Juno, and with suppliant gifts sue the favor of that sovereign mistress. The words are carefully chosen so that there is no hint to Dido who hears them of the real relation of Juno to this stranger who is to mean so much to her. Heinze's explanation of the passage as due to a reminiscence of the *Odyssey*, λ, 100 sq., is entirely superfluous; there is little similarity between the two passages save, as he notes, that they both refer to the future. But to what other sphere of time a prophecy can refer I do not see, and it is of the future, and, be it noted, the immediate future, concerning which

Aeneas has asked: *fare age—quae prima pericula vito / quidve sequens tantos possim superare labores?* (362 sq.). The very indefiniteness of Helenus' words throws an atmosphere of mystery over what is still hidden while, at the same time, they recall to the reader the drama of the gods foreshadowed in book I.

The position of Apollo in III is simply and satisfactorily explained by the position of Apollo as god of colonists and by his relation to the religious reforms instituted by Augustus,—a delicate compliment to the Emperor and another link connecting the legendary past with Vergil's own vital present. It is to be noted, however, that Vergil is careful to connect Apollo with the wanderings of his hero from the very beginning, for in IV, 345 Aeneas tells Dido, *Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis*, and in VI, 56, Aeneas prays to Apollo, *Phoebe, gravis Troiae semper miserate labores, —tot maria intravi duce te penitusque repostas / Massylum gentis praetentaque Syrtibus arva*.

It is line 500 of book III, however, which Heinze and Miss Crump find most awkward for their theories, and we have seen by what diverse methods they have tried to make it support their diverse views. But this line, too, like the others which I have considered is so suited to its context, arises so naturally out of the situation, that it cannot be used to support any conclusion save that Vergil was a poet.

Aeneas, when in Crete, learns for the first time, from the Penates (III, 163 sq.), that the *terra Hesperia*, a name which he, at least, had heard (cf. II, 781), was identical with *Italia*, of which the Grynian Apollo and other oracles had spoken (cf. above and III, 363), and Anchises (180 sq.) confirms this identification by recalling a prophecy of Cassandra, to which, naturally enough, no one had paid any attention.⁷ Henceforth *Italia* is uppermost in Aeneas' mind and the dire prophecy of the Harpies, which soon follows, only serves to keep it so.

⁷ It will be noticed that Vergil is careful here as everywhere to make the intervention of superhuman agents fit in with the psychological situation of his human characters. The pestilence and famine which have visited the Trojans are evidence that Crete cannot be their promised land, and Anchises has bidden his son return to Delos again to ask Apollo's will. All, therefore, that Aeneas had ever heard about

When, therefore, he meets Helenus, priest of Apollo, and questions him concerning the future, the word *Italia*, pregnant now with hope and dread, springs first to his lips (364). Helenus' first words, however, contain small comfort, for he tells him that that *Italia* which he, in his blindness (*ignarus*), thinks near, is still far, far away, and that many dangers still lie ahead. Nor of the final end of his wanderings does Helenus tell him exactly,—the *prima pericula* (367) are naturally emphasized,—only that he will recognize the end by finding near a secluded stream, *secreti ad fluminis undam* (389), a sow all white with thirty young all white (392). Then, when the time comes for Aeneas' departure, Helenus' last words but emphasize the hopelessness of it all,—*Ausoniae* (cf. *terras Ausonias* in the Penates' prophecy, 171), *pars illa procul quam pandit Apollo* (479). Hence these words are in Aeneas' mind when he bids farewell to the prophet and to Andromache and looks his last upon the new Troy of their make-believe and contrasts the woe and hopelessness of his future with their *fortuna peracta* (493), lines 495 sq.:

*vobis parta quies: nullum maris aequor arandum,
arva neque Ausoniae semper cedentia retro
quaerenda. Effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis:—*

They have their river and a city called by the dear old names, and he, too, has a river, the *Thybris* of Creusa's prophecy, and if ever he will find it and the fields along its banks, *si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva / intraro* (500-1), and see the city builded for his people, then he and they will make of Epirus and Hesperia one Troy (501-505).

Line 500 is, therefore, so nicely fitted to the context that any theory which considers it merely as a part of a passage added by the poet to harmonize one book with another is untenable. The context, too, makes it clear that to Aeneas the *Thybris* is still but a name, its exact location still unknown, and Heinze's assumption that the line is not in harmony with the plan of this third book is equally untenable. Moreover, even if the poet had not told us that Aeneas had heard the name *Thybris*, the

the end of his voyage must have come into his mind as he lay upon his bed wondering about the meaning of the dark prophecies. He falls into a restless sleep, during which the Penates come and half solve the riddle.

use of the name here, after the reference to the river Xanthus, would, from the point of view of poetic art, have been entirely justifiable.

The poet has, however, told us how Aeneas learned the name, and the occasion when he learned it was one which inevitably was in Aeneas' mind at this moment of parting from Helenus and Andromache. The meeting with these two had made the sad past live again and with it the wife whom he had loved and lost, to whose son Andromache has just spoken (489) her sad farewell. It is Creusa's words, therefore, concerning the river of the promised land which come to his mind as he leaves this new Troy built on the banks of a new Xanthus, but clearly the location of that river is now no better known than it was at the time he first heard the name, his hopes of finding it seemingly no nearer realization.

For the words of Creusa's prophecy, II, 780 sq.: *terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva / inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris*, far from giving to Aeneas any definite information concerning the end of his voyage and the location of his future kingdom, as Heinze would have us believe, are in reality the darkest of all the fata. Surely the poet meant us to understand that to Aeneas *terra Hesperia* could have meant only "the land in the west," and *Lydius Thybris* only "the Thybris of Lydia."⁸ Vergil, therefore, is using the prophecy as others had used it before him,⁹ to give directions which seem explicit and final on the face of them and are yet not so, or which give the name of a place and not its situation, another instance of that irony which, as I have noted, Vergil employs with such fine effect throughout this whole story of his hero's wanderings. Vergil is careful, moreover, to show us that to Aeneas the location of the Tiber, of Latium, even of Italy was throughout unknown. He and his companions begin their voyage "doubtful whither the prophecies (those of Creusa and of Apollo) were

⁸ It is worth noting that it is only here in the Aeneid that Vergil applies this epithet to the Tiber. Strictly the term is an anachronism, but it is justifiable in Creusa's mouth since she, for this moment, at least, is an omniscient divinity, and he may have intended its use to make the prophecy, from Aeneas' point of view, more meaningless than ever.

⁹ Cf. Heinze, l. c., p. 85.

to lead them," III, 7. Nor does Helenus' prophecy remove the doubt, inasmuch as he gives specific directions concerning the immediate hazards only (the *prima pericula* of Aeneas' question), and does not mention either Latium or the Tiber. Aeneas' own words in III, 500 show that he knows nothing of the location of the river, and he receives no enlightenment, of course, during his stay in Carthage. Hence, after his return from Carthage to Sicily, as he stands by his father's tomb, the hopelessness of his quest, his uncertainty of the location of the promised land and its river, finds pathetic expression: V, 82, *non licuit finis Italos fataliaque arva / nec tecum Ausonium quicumque est quaerere Thybrim*. These words afford clear evidence, surely, that Vergil did not want us to understand that Creusa's prophecy in II. 780 sq. conveyed to Aeneas any definite information as to the end of his voyage.

One would assume, therefore, that, since in V Vergil represents his hero as being ignorant of the location of his new home, he must have been ignorant of it during his stay in Carthage, and I see nothing in the lines quoted by Heinze in support of the contrary view to disprove this assumption. Vergil certainly makes it as clear as a poet can or need throughout the first six books that to Aeneas and his followers there were known certain prophecies concerning a promised land to which he was to lead them. The exact situation of this land they are not told, nor did the prophecies agree as to its name. This some gave as *terra Hesperia*, or simply *Hesperia*, so the mad Cassandra (III, 185) and Creusa who, speaking to Aeneas only, connects with it a river, *Lydius Thybris*; others as *Italia* (cf. I, 380; III, 364; IV, 345; VI, 61); others, we must suppose, since the poet need not tell us every detail, as *Latium* (I, 205; 554; VI, 67). No one of these names, however, could have meant more to the Trojans than another, and not until they are in Crete do they learn that *Hesperia* and *Italy* are one. Thus *Italia*, even though its exact location is still unknown, becomes something more definite, and Helenus' prophecy, full of mystery as it is, disappointing as it is in regard to the goal, assures them of its reality and of the purpose of the gods that they shall settle therein. *Italia, Italia*, is their glad cry when they first behold it (III, 523). Full of happiness, therefore, they leave Sicily (I, 35), from which, according to Helenus, they will reach the

land of their hope, *finis Italos* (III, 440). Then comes the storm, they are ship-wrecked on a desolate shore, Italia has once more proved an empty dream.

Here, when their leader, with a smile upon his lips, although his heart is as heavy as theirs (I, 208), tries to reassure them, what can he say? The very logic of the situation requires some reference to their goal other than Italia; the word is now, so to speak, one of bad omen. We may catch an echo of their feelings regarding it in the hopelessness of Aeneas' reply to his mother a little later, I, 380 sq.: *Italiam quaero—Europa atque Asia pulsus*. Hence it is that the poet makes his hero say *Latium not Italia*, I, 205 sq.: *tendimus in Latium sedes ubi fata* ("prophecies") *quietas ostendunt*. Even though we are not told definitely from what *fatum* the Trojans had learned the name, there is certainly nothing in these words to show, as Heinze maintains, that to the Trojans—and Vergil is writing from their point of view, not from ours—the exact location of Latium was any better known than that of Italia had been. We see from Ilioneus' words in I, 530 sq., 554 sq., that it was not. *Est locus*¹⁰ is as definite as he can be; he knows its names, Hesperia, Italia, Latium, so much he has heard from the old prophecies or from his leader; but without that leader he makes it clear that the quest is hopeless, and that Sicily, where at least there were *sedes paratae* (I, 557), would have to serve them as their new home. So, too, Aeneas, in his address to Dido, 595 sq., speaks as one uncertain of his goal: *semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt, / quae me cumque vocant terrae*.

The situation in IV is, of course, the same as in I, and what is true of the references to Italia and Latium in the one is true of the references in the other. In both not only do these references carry no idea of the definite location of the promised land, but they arise naturally out of the dramatic situation. During that winter of sweet sin, so long to all but Aeneas and

¹⁰ Lines I, 530-534 are found also in III, 163-166, which the poet has put in the mouth of the Penates when they, acting for Apollo, speak to Aeneas. In themselves, however, since they are suited to the context in both places, they afford no evidence on which to decide which passage was written first. *Alii alia putant*; cf. Heinze, p. 89, n. 2.

Dido (IV, 193), Vergil makes it clear¹¹ that Aeneas often thought of Italia and all that it implied of duty and responsibility to his son; hence the emphasis which is put upon regnum Hesperiae (355) and regnum Italiae, in Mercury's message from Jupiter (IV, 275). And the moral awaking of the hero brings with it, therefore, the realization that he must sacrifice his love to his duty and continue his quest for that Italia of the prophecies which Mercury's words recall,—if, indeed, they were ever far from his consciousness; hence his reply to Dido, 345, *Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis*. That Dido in 432 should mention Latium is not surprising since she had heard this name from Ilioneus (I, 554), if not from Aeneas himself.

This summary, imperfect as it is, will make it apparent, I trust, that every line in the first six books in which reference is made to the end of Aeneas' wanderings arises naturally out of the dramatic situation, and that in each case the form of expression chosen by the poet finds its justification in this fact. From the point of view of the poet's art this is all that is necessary, but we may, I think, go farther and say that there is no such serious disagreement between these references as to justify any definite conclusion regarding the priority of this or that book in which they occur. On the other hand they do justify the conclusion that the poet, in telling of the wanderings of his hero, had from the beginning one plan in mind, namely, that the name, or rather the names, of the promised land should be known to Aeneas and the Trojans before their departure from Asia, but that only gradually should there come to them enlightenment as to the meaning of these names, their essential oneness, and the exact location of the haven which they designated.

M. B. OGLE.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

¹¹ Cf. IV, 351 sq. where Aeneas justifies to Dido his decision to return to his duty, *me patris Anchisae, quotiens umentibus umbris / nox operit terras,—me puer Ascanius capitisque iniuria cari, / quem regno Hesperiae fraudo et fatalibus arvis*. Heinze's objection that we should have been told of these visions before Mercury's visit is nonsense; Aeneas has not yielded without a struggle between his love and his duty, just as Dido has not (460 sq.), but he could not have told her of it any more than she could have told him.

IV.—NOTES ON JUVENAL, I, III, VI, X.

SATIRE I. JUVENAL'S PREFACE (1-13).

Semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam
vexatus quotiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
impune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,
hic elegos? impune diem consumpserit ingens
Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri
scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?
nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus
Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
Vulcani; quid agant venti, quas torqueat umbras
Aeacus, unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,
Frontonis platani convulsaque marmora clamant
semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.

The commentators do not seem to have noticed how closely these lines resemble Vergil's preface to *Georgics* III (3 sqq.):

cetera quae vacuas tenuissent carmine mentes
omnia iam vulgata: quis aut Eurysthea durum,
aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?
cui non dictus Hylas puer¹ et Latonia Delos
Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno,
acer equis?

Here as in the early mention of the levee in *Georg.* II. 461 sq.,

si non ingentem foribus domus alta superbis
mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam,

Vergil suggests the theme of the later poet. But Vergil is deserting the well-worn stories of Greek mythology to write about the exploits of Augustus:

in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit (l. 16),

while Juvenal's choice of a modern subject is caused by the vices and follies of contemporary Rome, and his model is Lucilius, *sequitur Lucilius urbem* (Persius I. 114). This *timeliness* of his satire is stressed by Juvenal throughout his preface.

¹ Mayor and Friedländer quote this on Juv. I. 164, *multum quaesitus Hylas*.

It comes up a second time in lines 52 sqq.:

haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis? Heracleas
aut Diomedas aut mugitum labyrinthi, etc.,

and a third time at the end, 163 sqq.:

nulli gravis est percussus Achilles
aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus:
ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens
infremuit, etc.,

thus closing on the same note on which he began (cp. *magnus-Auruncae-alumnus*, I. 20). It is this symmetrical arrangement of the poem to which I especially wish to call attention, in view particularly of Nettleship's criticisms of "the ill-proportioned piece," in which so many of the commentators concur.²

Another example of three-fold repetition is the *lectica* of the criminal profiteer, which annoys Juvenal in much the same way as an automobile a pedestrian today.

1) lines 30-33:

nam quis iniquae
tam patiens urbis tam ferreus ut teneat se
causidici nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis
plena ipso?

2) lines 63-67:

nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces
quadrivio cum iam sexta cervice feratur
———
signator falsi?

3) lines 158-9:

qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita vehatur
pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?

The editors generally censure Juvenal for the digression on the sportula,³ lines 94-136, but this is most carefully constructed

² Prof. H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poets*, p. 292, is an exception: "No better preface has ever been written."

³ H. L. Wilson *ad loc.* says "in lines 135 ff. the vice of *μωροφayλα* is taken up at greater length," and refers to A. Gercke, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1896, p. 981, which I have not been able to see.

triae; d. natos, d.' pueris;⁵ and the artifice is carried further. The extremes (a. coniugis, a.' viro, d. natos, d.' pueris) have the words changed, whereas in the means (b. sororis, b.'sorori, c. patriae, c.' patriae) the words are the same.

I. 170 sq.

Experiar quid concedatur in illos
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina.

Does this mean much more than that Juvenal intended to take Roman subjects and not Greek myths? Just above he had spoken of Aeneas, Achilles and Hylas as contrasted with the objects of Lucilius' satires,—living men, *auditores*. Juvenal does not care for mythical subjects, but in his time attacks on contemporaries were impossible. So he takes a middle course, as indicated by "pone Tigellinum" line 155. Tigellinus implies Nero, i.e. an Emperor.⁶ That even this middle course was not without its dangers is shown by the persistent story of the actor Paris and Juvenal's exile.⁷ Compare Maternus and his *Cato*, Tacitus, *Dial.* 3. One might mention "Cleon," an anonymous pamphlet which appeared in England during the late war. It was documented like a doctor's dissertation, but the whole history of Cleon was told with the closest possible reference to a well-known public man of the day, and in view of "Dora's" activities the author was probably well advised not to sign his name. So too the objects of Juvenal's attacks were well known even though they were called by the names of former evil-doers, e.g. III. 53-4:

carus erit Verri, qui Verrem tempore quo vult
accusare potest.

SATIRE III.

Juvenal's craftsmanship in this poem has been so universally admired that it does not call for defence; however, some in-

⁵ For similar examples in Catullus and Vergil, see my articles *C. R.* (1908) XXII, p. 180, and *C. Q.* (1916) X, p. 92, note.

⁶ Compare Charles I and Strafford, "If he is Sejanus, I must be Tiberius."

⁷ VII. 92, with the scholiast's note, and the statement in the *Vita*.

stances of symmetrical arrangement seem to have escaped notice. It is natural that the poem at the end should return to Umbricius and his wagon-load of household goods, but the correspondences in thought and language are remarkably close. First of all, in the last line (322) *auditor* of P, the Viennese fragment, and F, is supported against *adiutor* of the other MSS., if we note that

Saturarum ego, ni pudet illas
auditor gelidos veniam *caligatus* in *agros*

is contrasted with lines 8 sq.:

mille pericula saevae
urbis et *Augusto* recitantes *mense* *poetas*.

Here cool fields are contrasted with hot Rome, *caligatus* with *togatus* (implied, of course, of dress at the recitation in the city), *poetas* and their subjects from mythology with Juvenal and his satires. Compare the way *auditor* is used I. 1:

Semper ego *auditor* tantum?

(i. e. of mythological subjects) with the same word in I. 166 sq.:

rubit *auditor* cui frigida mens est
criminibus,

(i. e. of satires).

Further, *Cumis*, line 2, is taken up by *Cumis*, line 321, the penultimate line.

Line 3:

unum civem donare *Sibyllae*,

balances line 320, third from the end:

ad *Helvinam* *Cererem* *vestramque* *Dianam*.

In each case there is a reference to the civic religious interests of the town.

In lines 4 sq.:

ianua *Baiarum* est et gratum litus *amoeni*
secessus,

there is a contrast between the health resort of fashionable Rome and Juvenal's journey for rest to his old home in lines 318 sq., fourth and fifth from the end:

quotiens te

Roma tuo refici properantem reddet Aquino.

The references to *raeda*, line 10, and *iumenta* and *mulio* 316 sq., are more obvious, but they help to illustrate the symmetry of the two passages.

With line 4:

ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni
secessus,

compare Seneca, *Epist.* 55. 7: hoc tamen est commodissimum in villa (at Cumae) quod *Baias trans parietem habet* (i. e. next door); incommodis illarum caret, voluptatibus fruitur. Parallels to passages in Seneca are frequent in Juvenal, but I have not seen this one noted.

SATIRE VI.

167 sq.

malo † Venusinam quam te, Cornelia, mater
Gracchorum.

As Venūsina is the quantity elsewhere (*e. g.* in Juvenal himself, I. 51) many editors print Venustinam after Bücheler. But, as licenses in the quantity of geographical proper names exist,⁸ may not Venūsina be right? The point is good—a girl from a small country town contrasted with a Roman lady of high degree (so Friedländer). The same thought is expressed by Tacitus, *Ann.* IV. 3, in relating the adultery of the younger Livia with Sejanus. The enormity of the crime is enhanced by the fact that Sejanus came from Volsinii. Illa, cui avunculus Augustus, socer Tiberius, ex Druso liberi, seque ac maiores et posteros *municipali* adultero foedabat. See Furneaux's note *ad loc.*, and compare Juvenal VIII. 237-8:

et modo Romae

municipalis eques,

(of Cicero). The reference to Horace's birthplace is perhaps supported by the mention below of the country girl from Sulmo, Ovid's birthplace: de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis (VI. 187).

⁸ *E. g.* VII, 15, Bithyni.

381 sq.

densi radiant testudine tota
sardonyches, crispo *numerantur* pectine chordae.

Mr. Duff says *ad loc.*: "This does not mean that the strings are *counted* with the *pecten*, but that they, being numerous,* are struck, and compares line 169, *numeras triumphos*, giving also examples from Martial. He does not, however, quote Vergil, *Georg.* IV. 347:

aque Chao *densos* divum *numerabat* amores,

which may well be the origin of this meaning in the Silver Age. (Compare *densi* in the preceding line (381) of Juvenal with *densos* here.)

SATIRE X.

54.

The argument from symmetry may be employed again in defence of the MS reading *petuntur*, where Mr. Duff, following

* An objection has been raised here,—“Why should seven strings be *numerous*?” For the *numerousness* of the number seven, see “Tristram Shandy,” chapter XVII:

“I mean, answered Dr. Slop, he would be denied the benefits of the last sacraments.—Pray how many have you in all, said my uncle Toby, for I always forget?—Seven, answered Dr. Slop—Humph! said my uncle Toby; tho’ not accented as a note of acquiescence, but as an interjection of that particular species of surprize, when a man, in looking into a drawer, finds more of a thing than he expected.—Humph! replied my uncle Toby. Dr. Slop, who had an ear, understood my uncle Toby as well as if he had wrote a whole volume against the seven sacraments.—Humph, replied Dr. Slop (stating my uncle Toby’s argument over again to him). Why, Sir, are there not seven cardinal virtues? Seven mortal sins? Seven golden candle-sticks? Seven heavens?—’Tis more than I know, replied my uncle Toby.—Are there not seven wonders of the world? Seven days of the creation? Seven planets? Seven plagues?—That there are, quoth my father, with a most affected gravity.”

Mr. Herbert Richards, reads *putentur*.¹⁰ In lines 8 sq., Juvenal says:

*nocitura toga, nocitura petuntur
militia;*

(with *optantibus ipsis* in the line before). Surely this is taken up by lines 54, 55, where Professor Housman punctuates:

*ergo supervacua aut <quae> perniciose petuntur?
propter quae fas est genua incutere deorum?*

and sets the two lines in a paragraph by themselves. All the editors refer to line 346:

nil ergo optabunt homines?

This threefold repetition is characteristic of Juvenal, as I have tried to show on Satire I. Note also 103 sq.:

*ergo quid optandum foret ignorasse fateris
Seianum.*

It may be noted that *opto* occurs eleven times in the satire, the last being in 346, quoted above. Then Juvenal goes on, lines 354 sqq.:

*ut tamen et poscas aliquid voveasque sacellis
.....
orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.
fortem posce animum, etc.,*

where the difference is vital.

GERTRUDE HIRST.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

¹⁰ In proposing *putentur* Mr. H. Richards said (C. R. II. 326) "the corruption may have arisen from the apparently similar '*nocitura petuntur*' of line 8."

REPORTS.

HERMES LVIII (1923), pp. 1-239.

Griechische Politik und Persische Politik im V. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (1-19). W. Judeich tries to establish the chronological sequence of events and thereby to clarify the policies of Athens and Sparta, respectively, in relation to the policy of Persia during the 5th century B. C. He rejects Kahrstedt's hypothesis of a Spartan-Persian peace, negotiated by Pausanias, as being without any foundation (cf. A. J. P. XLIV, 76). The peace of Kallias, although it was not a formal treaty, represented wise, mutual concessions. Athens now enjoyed for more than a generation the undisputed possession of her gains. The peace of Antalcidas (386 B. C.) illustrates the traditional narrow policy of Sparta.

Über die Ursprüngliche Reihenfolge Einiger Bruchstücke Heraklits (20-56). H. Gomperz, following the example of Paul Schuster, Bywater and Alois Patin, associates certain fragments of Heraclitus thereby gaining a deeper insight into their meaning. Diels, distrusting such 'arbitrary' attempts, grouped them under the names of the respective sources. Although H's style was aphoristic, he must have expressed himself with some continuity, as 24 transitions are made with γάρ, 17 with δέ and 9 by means of καί, οὐν or διό. This computation does not include the particles that seem to have been added by the writers citing the fragments; on the other hand it is probable that they frequently omitted original particles. Gomperz estimates that the 132 genuine fragments with their 1472 words constituted nearly one half of Heraclitus' book, which makes it probable that some of the extant fragments were closely associated.

Lesefrüchte (57-86). U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff continues this series with numbers CLXXI-CLXXX (cf. Hermes LIV, p. 46). He discusses Lysias I, Hyperides' For Euxenippus, Theocritus VIII, which he considers to be spurious. The Ἀττικὸν Δείπνον of Matron of Pitana etc.

Die Kürzenmeidung in der Griechischen Prosa des IV. Jahrhunderts (87-108). Fr. Vogel gives greater precision to Blass's discovery that Demosthenes avoided the succession of three or more short syllables, and presents in a table of all the speeches, the several ratios of occurrence per 100 lines of Teubner text. Thus the third Philippic (IX) has 6.32%, that is an average of less than seven occurrences for every 100 lines, and the speech On the Crown (XVIII), 3.85%, that is, less than four occurrences. Omitting XXVII, XXVIII and XXX, undoubtedly speeches of his youth, and the doubtful XLI and LV,

he finds the ratio for the rest of Demosthenes' writings to be 4.57%. In marked contrast with this low percentage, the undoubtedly spurious speeches have percentages ranging from 20.93% (VII) to 33.45% (IL), only the Neaira and Epitaphius show respectively 17.05% and 6.64%. The low percentage in Demosthenes is unquestionably due to conscious effort; but Vogel believes that the percentages that he computed for his contemporaries, although they range in the neighborhood of 20% to 30%, reveal a delicate sense of rhythm in the prose writers of the IV century B. C., which is comparable to the feeling for meter and rhythm in poets. He gives tables for the orators: Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines etc., and also for the writings of Xenophon, Plato, Thucydides, Herodotus, Polybius, Plutarch, Lucian etc. His comments on individual cases are interesting, as viz., that the *λόγος ἐρωτικός* of Lysias in the Phaedrus contrasts with its 24% of occurrences with the 19% in the rest of the speech; and that the variations in the style of Lysias' speeches include a variation in the succession of three or more short syllables. The *Nomoi*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Sophistes* and *Politicus*, generally regarded as works of Plato's advanced age, show among his writings the highest averages, just as these same dialogues show, according to W. Janell, the most careful avoidance of hiatus. The *Characters* of Theophrastus show greater care than his scientific works. Vogel seems to have found a criterion that may be of use in determining the genuineness of a work.

Miscellen: W. H. Baehrens (109-112) welcomes W. Otto's 'Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius' (Sitzungsber. der Bayr. Ak. d. Wiss. 1919, 10) as containing a number of corrections of Mommsen's article in *Hermes* III, 31 ff. He upholds, however, Mommsen's year 93 A. D., as the date of Pliny's praetorship, against Otto's attempt to show that 95 A. D. was the correct date.—H. Heinze (112) thinks that *Thyrsis* in Verg. *Bucol.* VII 41-44 answers in the name of Galatea, just as *Menalcas* *Bucol.* III 78 answers in the name of Iollas, and *Damoetas* in *Theocr.* VI 21 in that of Polyphemus.

Ionische Geschichtsschreibung (113-146). E. Howald cites passages from Herodotus to show that his lack of patriotism is incompatible with the conventional conception of national historian "der die Schilderung der griechischen Freiheitskriege sich zur Lebensaufgabe wählt." This '*moral insanity*' is not confined to the political sphere; but is equally striking in purely human affairs. His attitude is that of an amused observer, who is mainly interested in the psychology of the individual, in his love, hate, cruelty, desire for power and gain, and takes note

of the ups and downs of human fortune. His aim is to entertain, hence while furnishing knowledge of a superficial kind, he is partial to marvellous tales, and is careful to avoid the tedium of long stories and a rigid scheme of narrative. Howald thinks, however, that these characteristics were not so much individual with Herodotus as they were peculiar to the mercantile atmosphere of Ionia, where material prosperity was prized higher than national freedom. An instructive parallel may be found in Boccaccio, whose similar characteristics were due to the commercial life of Florence. The 'Kaufmannskultur reichgewordener Städte' accounts for Herodotus' mentality; but his style was after all artificial. It had become good form not to apply moral rules, but to observe without showing emotion, to show interest in anything human, and above all to seek variety (*ποικιλία*). The struggle of the Greeks with the people of the Orient formed the framework of his history. This furnished a thread to which he could attach all manner of digressions, long or short. These *λόγοι* are the main thing in the first books. It is a mistake to regard the Egyptian and Scythian *λόγοι* as originally distinct works. It is also wrong to seek everywhere for sources. For Herodotus was a *λογοποιός*, who did not hesitate to incorporate material from any source whatsoever and to elaborate it as freely as a poet. Thucydides adopted this artistic freedom in his speeches in spite of his general condemnation of an *ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν*. Herodotus' history must have made a strange impression in the mother country where democracy and rhetoric held sway, a world that was unfamiliar with the Kaufmanns-kultur of Ionia. But towards the end of the century the moneyed aristocracy of Athens began to look with favor on the culture of Ionia. Kritias, Lysias, Andocides and even Plato show it in their style. Later, especially in Alexandria, the influence of this Ionic style is apparent. To show this Howald analyses the works of Callimachus.

Über die Proömien des Lukrez (147-174). K. Barwick does not accept Jacoby's complicated solution of the apparent dualism in the introduction of Book I (cf. A. J. P. XLIV 73); but lets two distinct proemia follow the prayer to Venus (1-43), viz. a (v. 136-145 + 50-61) and b (62-135 + 146-148). Now as Mehwaldt (A. J. P. 32, 467) has shown that Book IV was written before Book III, the order of composition must have been: I, II, IV, III, V and VI. It is therefore a striking fact that proemium b in Book I resembles the proemia of Books III, V, and VI, especially in eulogizing Epicurus; whereas the other, simpler proemium a falls into a class with the proemia of Books II and IV. Hence it appears that when Lucretius came to compose Book III he wrote a more elaborate proe-

mium, including a eulogy of Epicurus, a plan which he followed in his introductions to Books V and VI. This accounts for prooemium b of Book I, which evidently was intended to replace the other simpler one, but as it was probably written on a separate sheet, confusion was wrought in the later editing. There are of course many details. He finally disposes of Mussehl's elaborate attempt to show that the order of composition was: I, II, V, IV, III and that Book VI was worked out in stages during the composition of V, IV, and III. Barwick finds that his order agrees with the order of Epicurus' own work, as shown in his letter to Herodotus.

Diktynna (175-186). E. Maass elucidates the fragment in *Oxyrhynchospapyri IV* (1904) p. 63, no. 661 which tells of the pursuit of a female, who jumps into the water and is caught in a net, thereupon a second pursuit and, by conjecture, the death of the second pursuer. The female was evidently the goddess Diktynna, who was originally an earth divinity, as shown by the literature dealing with Britomartis in Crete, Aphaia in Aegina and Laphria in Argos and Cephallenia. The legend of the pursuit was originally located in Aegina and from there was brought to Crete by Aeginetan settlers where Minos became the first pursuer, and as the goddess fled to Aegina the original pursuer was now the second. This expanded legend is the subject matter of the papyrus fragment. The name Diktynna — Diktya was explained by the legend of the net (*δίκτυον*), but its origin is due to the use of nets in the cult of certain divinities, which in turn arose from attributing a mystic meaning to nets used as ornaments. Accordingly nets and fillets on sacred objects that were held to be a kind of palladium, came to be regarded as mystic bonds of supernatural strength. This explains the Delphic omphalos, covered with a sculptured network, which closed the spot where the earth-spirit fled from Apollo (cf. *Apocalypse* 20, 2). The article contains other interesting details.

Die Feldzüge Antiochos' des Groszen nach Kleinasien und Thrakien (187-229). O. Leuze determines a number of chronological points in the history of Antiochus' campaigns, as Niese is frequently mistaken and Bevan avoids a decision in chronological controversies.

Die Zeitbestimmung von Hypereides' Rede für Lykophron (230-237). A. Körte shows that the second speech for Lykophron (*Oxyrhynchus-Papyri XIII* pp. 74 ff., no. 1607), which is not by Hyperides, to whom Grenfell and Hunt were inclined to attribute it, as it shows a careful avoidance of hiatus, reveals that Lycophron tried to influence Dioxippus against the mar-

riage of his widowed sister to Charippus by sending a letter to Olympia where Dioxippus was to be crowned for a victory. As the date of this victory was 336 B. C., and the trial took place three years after the sister's marriage, it becomes evident that the speech that Hyperides delivered must be dated much later than c. 341 B. C., the date that has been assumed. The excessive zeal of Lykurgus for the purification of morals is discussed.

Miscellen: J. Mussehl (238-239) interprets Martial IX, 95 as a play on alpha and omega. Alphius, once an intimate of Athenagoras, coipit nunc Olphius esse, uxorem postquam duxit Athenagoras. A similar interpretation explains Anth. Pal. XI, 15.—F. Jacoby (239-240) thinks a lacuna in Athenaeus VIII 333 A can partially be filled by means of the glossary P. Ox. 1801, which shows that Phylarchus had mentioned locusts, which were common in Cyprus, Cyrene, Barce, Aethiopia, etc.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA, Vol. LI (1923.)

Pp. 1-5. Gaetano De Sanctis and Augusto Rostagni. Editorial announcement of plans for the 'new series,' which begins with this fifty-first volume.

Pp. 7-39. Augusto Rostagni. The first instalment of a study of Empedocles' *Kaθappoί*. An attempt to reconstruct the argument of the poem, and to indicate the Pythagorean elements it contained.

Pp. 40-60. Vincenzo Ussani. A very readable essay on Fronto, written to serve as a chapter in a history of classical literature. The writer follows, in the main, the Latin text as given in the recent edition of C. R. Haines (Loeb Classical Library). Incidentally, he quotes a highly complimentary estimate of Fronto from the poet Giacomo Leopardi.

Pp. 61-70. Vincenzo Costanzi. The Lion of Chaeronea. The writer is inclined to agree with Beloch, that the monument was erected by Philip, not by the Thebans.

Pp. 71-77. Angelo Taccone. A defense of the MS reading *παρείπων*, in Sophocles, Antig. 369—"or s'egli intreccia (*oppure mette a lato*) le leggi del paese e la giustizia giurata ai Numi, etc." The word alludes only to Creon.

Pp. 78-100. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. On the law of the 'correptio iambica,' and the 'correptio trochaica et spondaica.' The shortening cannot always be explained as due

to the accent. From the beginning, there was a certain amount of laxity in Roman prosody, especially in the Comedy. Some of the 'shortenings' may really be cases of synizesis. The fact that the law operates only within the thesis or arsis of a single foot suggests that the poet was merely taking advantage of the 'prosodic oscillation' of the language.

Pp. 101-130. Reviews (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV; T. Frank, Vergil: a Biography; A. Schulten, Avieni Ora Maritima; etc.).

Pp. 131-140. Notes and news.

Pp. 141-144. List of new books received.

Pp. 145-166. Ettore Bignone. Discussion of the fragments of Antiphon's Aletheia (Pap. Ox. 1364, 1797). This is Antiphon the sophist—apparently a different person from Antiphon the orator.

Pp. 167-186. Gaetano De Sanctis. A study of the Athenian archons of the third century. The writer quotes and discusses an important inscription from Salamis, published by A. D. Keramopulos, Athens, 1923.

Pp. 187-194. Nicola Festa. Extracts from Florus in the Scholia on Petrarch's Africa (Ep. I 18, 15-37; I 22, 1-35). The text is quoted from Cod. V (= Marc. Ven. XII 17).

Pp. 195-216. Lorenzo Dalmasso. On the lexical notes in Aulus Gellius. The first instalment deals with the formation of words.

Pp. 217-232. G. Bendinelli. The "year's work" in Archæology and the History of Art (a new feature of the RIVISTA).

Pp. 233-256. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 256-268. Notes and news (a report of the fourth session of the International Academic Union, at Brussels, April, 1923).

Pp. 269-272. List of new books received.

Pp. 273-286. J. Beloch. On Phaedrus of Sphettos, an Athenian statesman in the first half of the third century. A decree in his honor is given in I. G., II² 1, 682.

Pp. 287-308. Gaetano De Sanctis. A study of the Athenian inscription published by E. Ziebarth in 1898, Ath. Mitt., XXIII 27 ff.

Pp. 309-332. Ettore Bignone. A study of Pap. Ox. 1797 (Part XV), continued from p. 166.

Pp. 333-343. Vasile Pârvan. I. *Ordessos* = Odessa (Russia). The ancient mention of an *Odessus* (or *Ordessus*) on the

north shore of the Black Sea seems to be an error. Pliny probably transferred the name from the Thracian Odessus. II. *Uscudama* = Adrianopoli. The name should be written *Uscudava*, a city founded by Dacians who came from the valley of the Oescus. *Dava* means 'city.'

Pp. 344-350. Bruno Lavagnini. On the etymology of *mefitis*. The word is probably Oscan, from a root **medh*, 'to intoxicate.'

Pp. 351-353. Angelo Taccone. On Soph. Phil. 1092 ff. In 1094 read ἐλῶσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἴσχω. In 1092 for εἶθ' read εἰτ'. The meaning will be, "Ormai su per l'etra in alto i timidi augelli con lo stridulo soffio de' venti trasvoleranno; ch' io non posso ormai trattenerli!"

Pp. 354-384. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 385-396. Notes and news (archæological, bibliographical, etc.)

Pp. 397-400. List of new books received.

Pp. 401-423. Augusto Rostagni. Filodemo contro l'estetica classica. I: Composizione e nesso logico del V libro Περὶ ποιημάτων. Discussion of Ch. Jensen's Philodemus: Ueber die Gedichte, Fünftes Buch, Berlin, 1923. Neoptolemus was Peripatetic, rather than Academic.

Pp. 424-467. Giovanni Capovilla. Il dio Heron in Egitto. The worship of Ἡρων (called Ἡρως in Callimachus, Epig. 25) was introduced into Egypt by Thracian mercenaries, early in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Pp. 468-484. Lorenzo Dalmaso. On the lexical notes in Aulus Gellius. II. This instalment deals with Graecisms.

Pp. 485-502. Reviews and book notices (L. A. Michelangeli, Anacreonte e la sua fortuna nei secoli; G. Giarratano, M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata; etc.).

Pp. 503-507. Notes and news.

Pp. 508-512. List of new books received.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REVIEWS.

A Study in the Commerce of Latium. From the Early Iron Age through the Sixth Century, B. C. By LOUISE E. W. ADAMS. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Classical Studies, Number 2.

Miss Adams has dealt with a precarious subject in a skilful and interesting way. For although both her subject and her period are among those for which definite data are almost always insufficient and in innumerable cases entirely lacking, she has through nice discrimination and a wary use of sources arrived at highly probable conclusions.

She begins with an account of the earliest maritime expeditions in the Mediterranean and then passes to a discussion of the "Civilization in Latium in the Early Iron Age" (Chap. 1), "The Great Period of Importation" (Chap. II), "The Overland Route from Etruria" (Chap. III), "The Etruscan Occupation of Rome" (Chap. V) and "Rome's First Commercial Treaty" (Chap. VI). A classified bibliography (pp. 73-77) gives selected titles in "Commerce and Colonizing," "Chronology and Characterization of the Iron Age," "Topography," "Latian and Etruscan Material of the First and Second Periods of the Iron Age," and "Races of Italy."

In sketching the background of her subject in the Introduction, Miss Adams fully recognizes the importance of the maritime trade carried on by the Ionians but is manifestly not willing to join the ranks of those who are inclined to doubt the great activity of the Phoenicians in over-seas commerce. Whether these Phoenicians, who she believes were the first traders to visit the West coast of Italy, carried goods of their own manufacture is not clear. Nor does it matter very much. In the early Iron Age at least they seem to have traded very little with Latium. The eastern objects of this period found in Latium seem to have been obtained by trade with other Italian peoples. On the north were the Etruscans, in the south the Greek colonies of Campania, and it was inevitable that some of the trade and cultural influences that manifested themselves in these regions at an early date should in some slight degree appear in Latium. At this period, however, the influence seems to have been almost negligible. Through the eighth century the Latins, as compared with their Etruscan or Campanian neighbors, remained an almost hopelessly provincial people.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Miss Adams' dissertation is her reconstruction of the overland trade-route from Etruria to Campania. Like many of her other theories her views

in regard to this road are based solely on archæological material. Believing that the objects found in the Bernardini and Barberini tombs at Praeneste indicate the presence of ruling Etruscan princes in that city (cf. Curtis in *Memoirs of American Academy*, Vol. III and Frank in his *Economic History of Rome*), she sees in it the key fortress that commanded the line of trade between Etruria and the South of Italy. From Caere on the Etruscan coast the road ran to Veii, then into Latium, passing through Fidenæ, Gabii and Praeneste, and on into Campania. As evidence of the probable connection between Praeneste and Caere, Miss Adams draws attention to the striking resemblance between the furniture of the two tombs mentioned above and that of the famous Regulini-Galassi tomb in Caere. If her conclusions are sound, commercial relations with Etruria and the South were established in the eastern part of Latium at an earlier date than in Rome, and in the seventh century Praeneste was far superior to Rome in culture and in the range of its commercial relations. Rome's power was increasing, but her trade, like that of the other communities in Latium between the Tiber and the Alban hills, was for the most part of a local and restricted character.

Praeneste did not maintain her prestige. In the sixth century the Tarquins, raiding Etruscan princes from Tarquinii, seized Rome just as in all probability their fellow-countrymen had captured Praeneste in the preceding century. A period of expansion for Rome followed. The trade from Veii that had once followed the road to Praeneste was diverted to Rome, and that city and all the towns in its neighborhood began to get the benefit of a commerce the ramifications of which extended far beyond local boundaries. It was then for the first time that Rome could be said to participate directly in Mediterranean trade. With the expulsion of the Tarquins this expansion ceased, and during the period between 509 B. C. and the end of the fourth century Rome not only did not extend her commercial relations with the East but she did not even hold her own.

In her discussion of the treaty with Carthage, the author follows Nissen and Frank in accepting Polybius' date, 509 B. C. If she has not completely established her case here, she has at any rate pointed out the weaknesses of Mommsen's arguments for the date 348.

Miss Adams has given us a stimulating and suggestive monograph. She should increase our obligations by pursuing the subject into the later centuries.

GORDON LAING.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, with an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the 'Tractatus Coislinianus.'
By LANE COOPER. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922. xxi + 323 pp.

The common belief that Aristotle treated the subject of comedy in some chapters of the *Poetics* that are now lost—often spoken of as the lost second book of the *Poetics*—is based in part upon the following considerations: In chapter 3 of the *Poetics* he speaks of Aristophanes by the side of Homer and Sophocles, apparently regarding him as the representative of comic poetry as they were the representatives of epic and tragic poetry respectively. Then in the beginning of chapter 6, before taking up the discussion of tragedy, he says that he reserves until later a discussion of the epic and comedy, but, while he fulfills this promise as regards epic poetry in chapters 23 and 24, he nowhere includes a discussion of comedy in the *Poetics*, as we have it. Furthermore, in two passages of the *Rhetoric* we are told that the various kinds of laughter have been enumerated and analyzed in the *Poetics*, a statement which can not be verified in the extant work, and yet four other references to the *Poetics* in the *Rhetoric* can be verified.

A tenth-century manuscript in the De Coislin collection in Paris contains a theory of comedy in a condensed form, the source of which is to be sought in some able thinker of antiquity. Kayser who has given careful study to this *Tractatus Coislinianus*, as it is called, regards it as the most valuable of the ancient treatises on Greek comedy for an investigation into the history of the art of poetry. Its manifest kinship to the *Poetics* of Aristotle was noticed by Cramer, who first edited it. Bernays in his reconstruction of the Aristotelian theory of comedy made the De Coislin Tractate his basis, because he believed that it was derived ultimately from Aristotle; and he supplemented it with the few direct references to comedy in the *Poetics*. But whereas Bernays subordinates the *Poetics* to the Tractate, Professor Cooper in his reconstruction subordinates the Tractate to the *Poetics*, holding that by far the greater part of an Aristotelian theory of comedy is to be found in the *Poetics* and treating the authentic elements of the Tractate as an addendum. Furthermore, he takes issue with the opinion of Bernays and others that Aristotle underrated Aristophanes and preferred Middle Comedy, and he argues convincingly in his excellent chapter on "Aristotle and Aristophanes" not only that Aristotle was interested in Aristophanes and did not underestimate him in comparison with later comic poets, but that he recognized his genius and appraised his worth correctly, and

was the same penetrating and incisive critic in his judgment of Aristophanes as in his judgment of Sophocles and Homer.

Professor Cooper's reconstruction of Aristotle's theory of comedy from the *Poetics* is derived not only from what is actually said about comedy but also from what may be inferred from the statements about other forms of literary art; for much of the *Poetics* in its present shape is implicitly applicable to comedy and may be made directly applicable with a little manipulation. Hence, assuming that the scientific method employed by Aristotle in the investigation of comedy was virtually the same as that used in the case of tragedy and epic poetry, Professor Cooper re-writes the *Poetics* with such changes as are required to make it a treatise on comedy. "The essence of my procedure," he says, "is to make the necessary shift in the *Poetics*; to work back and forth from principles in that work to examples in comedy; and to use the Tractate as important but subsidiary, adding examples to illustrate it, after the fashion of Starkie, from Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Molière, and other sources." In this new version of the *Poetics* as it applies to comedy he has produced a companion volume to his "Amplified Version" of the *Poetics* which he published in 1913, and he has incorporated in it, within brackets, illustrative examples and timely comment as in the earlier work. In the present volume the adaptation of the *Poetics* to comedy is followed by (1) a translation of the De Coislin Tractate from the text of Kaibel, (2) an amplification of the Tractate and extensive illustration of its various categories from Aristophanes and others, as indicated above, (3) a translation of John Tzetzes' remarks on comedy in his First Proem to Aristophanes, and (4), as an appendix, the author's article on "The Fifth Form of 'Discovery' in the *Poetics* of Aristotle," reprinted and adapted from *Classical Philology* 13, 251-61. An Introduction of 165 pages precedes the body of the work.

In this Introduction many matters of interest are treated, none more interesting than the discussion of the effect of comedy. What in an Aristotelian theory of comedy would correspond to the catharsis of pity and fear which is the proper effect of tragedy? What emotions does comedy relieve? Plato associates anger and envy with comedy in the *Philebus*, and the analysis of anger and envy in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle has many points of contact with that in the *Philebus*. Quintilian too sees a relation between laughter and the emotions of anger and envy. Make an angry or envious man laugh with pleasure and he will cease to be angry or envious. In this way anger and envy may be said to be purged away by comedy. On the other hand, a different effect of comedy is indicated in the Tractate, when it is said that comedy 'through pleasure and laughter effects the purga-

tion of such emotions.' If this is not merely a clumsy imitation of Aristotle's words in the *Poetics* about the function of tragedy, it may mean that the audience at a comedy by giving vent to the risible faculty finds relief in this emotional discharge. This is the catharsis of laughter. It must be noted, however, that we have no unmistakable traces of a theory of comic catharsis by Aristotle, nor a definition of comedy by him implying such catharsis.

It is fortunate that the transformation of the *Poetics* into a treatise on comedy has been made by so competent a scholar and one so familiar with the *Poetics* as Professor Cooper, and by one, moreover, who estimates it so highly. 'The *Poetics*,' he says, 'is the only adequate investigation of a literary type with regard to form and function that we possess, and that too in spite of the numerous critical works that have sprung from its loins; . . . for method and perspective it never has been equalled in its field.' And he quotes Croiset to the effect that it is a masterpiece with a value well-nigh eternal. He has, furthermore, made accessible to students of 'English' and to classes in the drama the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, "the most important technical treatise on comedy that has come down to us from the ancients." To two of the categories of the Tractate, namely, comic dancing and the parts of *διάνοια*, he has given special study, and the illustrations of these topics are his own contributions.

It is true that the text is uncertain in the example of paronymy that Tzetzes gives to illustrate his fourth kind of comic diction, but, if one accepts the text that Professor Cooper (pp. 234, 288) follows, namely, *Μώμαξ καλοῦμαι Μίδας*, *Μώμαξ* well illustrates paronymy in that it is derived as a character name from the stem of *μῶμος* by the addition of the familiar name-forming suffix *-αξ*, and has about the same meaning (barring the element of the nickname) that **μωμητήης* had, if it existed. The passage means "Mr. Faultfinder is the name they give me Midas." It is not, therefore, correct to say, as Professor Cooper does on page 234, that "the proverbial jocular derivation of *Middleton* from *Moses*" applies to *Μώμαξ* and *Μίδας* here, nor to translate "I Momax am called Midas." And a knowledge of Fick's great work on proper names would have kept him from saying that "Middleton from Moses . . . illustrates the case of proper names derived one from another by clipping or addition or both." So also *Σταμνίας* in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 22 is a character name, and consequently the translation "Dionysus, son of — Old Beerbarrel" gives the tone better than "Dionysus, son of — Wine-jar," as Professor Cooper has it on pages 241 and 250 *bis*. (Compare *Class. Phil.* 2, 462; *A. J. P.* 42, 160.) But these are small

matters, and they do not detract from the general excellence of the work. The book deserves high commendation; it is a fine contribution of American scholarship, all the more remarkable because the author is not primarily a classicist; yet his contributions to classical study both in his teaching and in his published work win for him a worthy place in the ranks of classical students, and surely classicists would be proud to claim him.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

Early Latin Verse. By W. M. LINDSAY. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922. 372 pp. 8°.

For the student of Plautine verse this is a very important book. It is written by the man who for a great many years has been the most eminent of living Plautine scholars and may, we believe, be regarded as rounding out a long period in the development of the subject. Of course, the book has the qualities that we have always associated with Lindsay's name—extreme accuracy and a consummate command of the material. Among many excellent features of the work we would call attention especially to the list of words the prosody of which in Plautus requires special treatment (pp. 186-221) and to the exceptionally fine lists of material (on word-divisions within feet) found on pp. 82-105.

Mention should be made particularly of the second chapter (over a hundred pages) on *Plautus and Menander*. Lindsay gives us a careful comparison of Plautine and Menandrian usage, which seems to be the chief new contribution contained in the book. All of the chapters are good, but I was especially impressed with the fourth, on *Early Latin Meters*, which runs for over fifty pages and is thickly strewn with rich and varied learning. Then follow four lists of material and a good bibliography.

Lindsay's main aims, as stated on p. viii, are (1) to illustrate spoken Latin from Plautus and to throw light on peculiarities of literary Augustan forms, (2) to prepare the way for an adequate presentation of Plautus' lines by editors,—the drift is, we should say, towards a marked text—(3) to vindicate Plautus' artistic skill.

However, it is well to remember that the metricians are split on the problem of form. Lindsay belongs to a linguistic school that approaches the subject from the side of the material, the *ῥυθμιζόμενον*. There is another school, that of the so-called new metric, or the higher metric, that makes its approach from the

side of the form, the *ῥυθμός*. There are two kinds of metric: the ordinary, or traditional, metric and the Aristoxenian metric. For the former the meter is a simple succession of either feet or dipodies; for the latter the meter is a very complicated affair, built up out of overlapping blocks of felt portions of duration. The Plautine problem, up to and including Lindsay, has been handled on the basis of the non-Aristoxenian metric. The new metric is at bottom a revival and an extension of Aristoxenian thought. Hitherto this so-called new metric has for the most part been confined to Greek, but it is bursting its bounds there and is coming across into the Plautine problem. The result is an extreme conservatism in textual matters combined with an enormous complication of metrical doctrine.

The Plautine problem hinges on attitude towards conjectural emendation. Lindsay belongs to a school that frequently resorts to conjecture, not because the sense demands it, but purely for the purpose of simplifying the metrical problem. The question is whether the problem is as simple as Lindsay would have us believe, or whether he has merely put in metrically easy substitutes for things he does not understand. In Plautus the traditional metric demands a considerable amount of conjectural simplification of the metrical form presented by the manuscript tradition; but on the basis of an extension of Aristoxenian thought it is possible to get along with practically no conjectural emendation for purely metrical purposes. Which way is right?

Lindsay's attitude, or at least his possible attitude, towards the manuscripts may be illustrated from p. 108 of his book, where he would make his point by altering about forty lines. With this passage may be contrasted the lower part of p. 7 of Wilamowitz' paper on *Isyllos von Epidauros*. When a man has to 'emend' away the evidence of forty lines of text in order to make his point, we are not very enthusiastic believers that he is right. There is another way of explaining that material, according to which we do not need any alterations and simplifications of the traditional form of the particular verse.

It is a remarkable thing that the most of the alleged metrical mistakes of the scribes take place in the arses, the unictuated portions, of the feet. In his treatment of word-division within resolved feet (pp. 80-105) and of the correptions (pp. 35-59) Lindsay seems to attach no importance to this fact. We are not willing to believe that the scribes had the wonderful faculty of making mistakes in arses and of avoiding them in theses. The arsis is naturally the more unstable part of the foot, and we would rather believe that there are certain minute points of technique that the Plautine scholars have not understood.

The manuscripts give evidence of three kinds of so-called correptions, i. e. iambic, trochaic, and spondaic combinations functioning as pyrrhics. The Plautine scholars have recognized

iambic shortenings, but have tried to emend the trochaic and spondaic combinations away. But according to the manuscripts (as well as the inscriptions), these trochaic and spondaic functional pyrrhics are found only in arses and for the most part only in certain feet. Why should they be emended away?

In Greek and Latin there is a mass of tortuous detail having to do with the technique mostly of the arses of certain feet, especially of normally diplasic feet. There is a doctrine that the meters are mere successions of either simple feet or dipodies, but on that basis why should one foot be different from another? And yet the technique of the arses of the different feet is different. In the case of classic Latin verse, e. g., Lucian Mueller, building mostly on the work of Moriz Haupt and Lachmann, accumulated a bristling array of detail having to do especially with the collocation of proper names and with word-division and elision in connection with the arses of the various feet. In the classic Latin poets the harsher elisions in the various meters go into the arses of the same feet in the arses of which in Plautus lie the combinations that the Plautine scholars would emend away. That means, we believe, that the basic rationale of the meters is the same both in Plautus and in classic Latin verse. In general it is the same arses that in Greek verse are the seat of irregularity. We have here a problem that in its earliest form—it was then a Greek problem—dates back about 175 years to Richard Dawes (see White, *Verse of Greek Comedy*, p. 50, n. 1). In its wider aspects the problem has in Plautus been acute since Ritschl. The present writer does not believe that the Plautine scholars have got anywhere near the bottom of the matter.

The Plautine scholars admit irregularities in the arsis (the unictuated portion) of the first foot of the colon in iambic and trochaic verse: those arses can be treated as if they were dactylic and not iambic or trochaic arses. But §§ 70 and 205 of White's *Verse of Greek Comedy* suggest that we extend the doctrine in Plautus beyond the first foot of the colon to either foot of the first dipody of the colon. Then there is a further complication in both Greek and Latin. Caesural segments are in effect sorts of cola. For instance, the iambic trimeter and the iambic senarius after the penthemimeral caesura in effect end in a catalectic trochaic dimeter, and the arses of the first dipody of this dimeter may have dactylic peculiarities. For this dactylic motif in Plautus, as is well known, a cretic can be substituted, and (a thing that is not well known) either or both longs of this cretic can be resolved.

The admission of the pertinence of the ideas that we have suggested above would render superfluous a very large part of Lindsay's attempts to simplify the metrical material. We illustrate the matter from the fourth and the fifth feet of the iambic

senarius. In the inscriptions we find such lines as these (Buecheler's *Car. Lat. Epig.*) :

- 64, 1 hic est sepulta Pacilia Sospita pia proba,
 67, 4 nēmine ūmquam débui uíxi quòm fidè,
 175, 1 quod facere nati parentibus debuerunt suis,
 175, 3 quod debuit filius parentibus officium praestare,
 187, 1 dum uixi, uixi quomodo condecet ingenuom.

When such verses occur in Plautus, Lindsay says that the manuscripts are corrupt (*op. cit.*, pp. 91 f.) ; but why should he?

Again he would not admit as possible in Plautus things much milder than some of the following epigraphic examples (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90) (C. L. E.) :

- 37 moram si quaeris, sparge míliu(m) et cóllige,
 85, 1 decem et octo annorum nātus uixi ùt potui bene,
 3 ioceris, ludas hortor: hic súmma est seuéritas,
 100, 3 eques sepultus híc sum natus ánnos octo èt decem,
 103, B, 5 paréntes amáuit, n[ostram duxit] coniugem,
 108, 8 genuítque ex mé tres nátos quos relíquit parbulos,
 113, 3 prudens demándat ná[tos] paréntibùs,
 4 gestis honóribu[s uíxit á]nnis trigínta s[éptem],
 7 prudens demandat náto[s] maríto karíssimo,
 8 lucemque caruit. uíxit ánnis uigínti séx,
 141, 5 iugumque coniugálem pudícum piíssimo,
 195, 1 ita candidatus fiát honòratus tuus,
 2 et ita gratum edat múnus tuus múnenerarius.
 3 et tu (sis) felix, scríptor, si híc non scripseris.

But why not admit what we can explain? These feet can be anapaestic. We cite a remarkable Greek example, the only Greek instance of the 'cretic' motif with which at present I am acquainted (F. D. Allen in *Papers Am. Sch. Clas. Stud. Athens*, IV (1885-6), p. 47),

Δημαινέτης εἰμὶ μνημα τῆς Λαμψαγόρου.

Note the trochaic swing.

Lindsay has given us a very learned and very accurate work, and some of his lists of material are worthy of all praise. But in metrics Lindsay is an empiricist without any comprehensive body of fundamental doctrine. The newer movements in metrics are away from Lindsay. He has given us an easy exposition of a simplified Plautine problem. We are of the opinion that the heart of the Plautine problem lies in the material that Lindsay would explain away. Lindsay's scheme merely pushes the problem out of Plautus over into the popular inscriptions. The Plautine problem, down to and including Lindsay, has been handled without taking into consideration the evidence of the inscriptions. It has been fashionable to pooh-pooh the metrical inscriptions; but we are entering into a time of severer ideals, and when we can explain what is on the stones, we do not need to simplify what is in the manuscripts.

GILBERT H. TAYLOR.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anthologia Lyrica. Edidit E. Diehl. I. Poetae Elegiaci. II. Theognis, Carmen Aureum, Phocylidea. III. Iamborum Scriptores. IV. Poetae Melici. Monodia. Lipsiae, *In aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, 1922, 1923. 492 pp. 12°. (Teubner text edition.)

Baldwin (Charles Sears). *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic.* New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. 261 pp. 12°.

Campbell (James Marshall). *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great.* Diss. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. II.) *Catholic University of America*, Washington, D. C., 1922. 156 pp. 8°.

Delatte (Armandus). *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum.* Tomus X. Codices Athenienses descripsit Armandus Delatte. Brussels, *Maurice Lamertin*, 1924. 291 pp. 8°.

Flom (George T.) *The Language of the Konungs Skuggsiá (Speculum Regale).* Part II. Pronouns, Numerals and Particles. The Verbs and their Conjugations. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 4, November 1923.) *University of Illinois Press*, Urbana, Ill.

Frank (Tenney). *Roman Buildings of the Republic.* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III.) Rome, *American Academy in Rome*, 1924. 149 pp. Small 8°. \$2.50.

———. *Storia economica di Roma.* Tradotta da Bruno Lavagnini. Firenze, *Vallecchi Editore*, 1924. 274 pp. 12°. 12 L. unbound.

Hayward (Arthur L.) *Colloquial Italian.* New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1924. 136 pp. 12°. \$1.60.

Jews and Christians in Egypt. Illustrated by texts from Greek papyri in the British Museum edited by H. I. Bell, with three Coptic texts edited by W. E. Crum. London, *British Museum*, 1924. 140 pp. + plates. Small 4°. 10/ net.

Keith (A. Berriedale). *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory, and Practice.* New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. 405 pp. 8°. \$7.00.

Mackay (Donald Sage). *Mind in the Parmenides.* A study in the history of Logic. Columbia University Diss. 114 pp. 8°.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Volume IV. Rome, *American Academy*, 1924. 180 pp. + plates. Folio.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVI. Edited with translations and notes by Grenfell, Hunt and Bell. London, *Egypt Exploration Society*, 1924. 280 pp. + 42 pp. of indices + plates. Small 4°.

Reynolds (Reverend Graham). *The Clausulae in the De Civitate Dei of St. Augustine.* Diss. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. VII.) *Catholic University of America*, Washington, D. C. 67 pp. 8°.

Velleius Paterculus. Res Gestae Divi Augusti. With an English translation by Frederick W. Shipley. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.)

Wyld (Henry Cecil). *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope.* A chapter in the history of English. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1924. 140 pp. 12°.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLV, 4

WHOLE No. 180

I.—LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*.

Among the participants in a conspiracy against Nero in 65 A. D. was Marcus Annaeus Lucanus who attempted to free himself from blame by accusing his innocent mother. Unsuccessful in this he was given his choice in kinds of death, and chose to die by opening his veins. A poetical work of his, the *Pharsalia*, such is the tradition, was retouched and published by his uncle, the philosopher Seneca, who was shortly to die in the same way. The work was received with favor both by the critics and by the public. Quintilian says of him (10, 1, 90): *Lucanus ardens et concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*. The extent of his influence is suggested by Martial (14, 194):

Sunt quidam qui me dicant non esse poetam:
Sed qui me vendit bybliopola putat.

His standing was high also among the commentators who frequently refer to him in their comments on the earlier poets.

Although I have not had the experience, I can imagine that the acme of exhilaration on the part of the poet is the moment when he realizes that immortality is to be his, and proclaims the assured fact to the world. Lucan had this confidence in full measure (9, 980 ff.):

O sacer et magnus vatum labor, omnia fato
Eripis et populis donas mortalibus aevum.
Invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae;
Nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis,
Quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt vatis honores,
Venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
Vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo.

Homer and Lucan in one breath! But there were for Homer poetical realities that had perished for Lucan. "Sing, O Muse, Achilles' baneful wrath" sang Homer, and it is at least a pleasant fiction to think of the Muse directing the pen of a writer. But for Lucan the Muses were dead. He begins with the declaration

Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos,
Iusque datum sceleri canimus,

and a similar neglect of the Muses is shown in his address to Nero (1, 66):

Tu satis ad vires Romana in carmina dandas.

He then continues with

Fert animus causas tantarum expromere rerum,
combining a part of Ovid (*Metam.* 1, 1):

In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
Corpora,

and also of *Fasti* (3, 725):

Carminis huius opus causas expromere. . . .

For Homer the gods moved among men, and though they be but larger forms, yet they gave an elevation to his song that is not to be found in the *Pharsalia*. Shadowy and unsubstantial as they may have really been, they were still poetical realities for Vergil, as for Homer, but by the time of Lucan they had vanished from the thoughts of men. Without the Muses and the gods Lucan took on himself the task of breathing the breath of poetic life into a narrative of the actions of men. How far he may have drawn his material from Livy, or any other earlier writer, is of little moment, for actual reproduction would have meant but another history. Of far more moment are the poetical influences which affected him, and vice versa the influence which he had on those who followed him. Epic measures had been fixed by Vergil, and lyric strains by Horace, and he freely incorporated their vibrant notes in his own song.

I. ADAPTED MATERIAL.

There is a decided Senecan element in the *Pharsalia*, but of more interest are the suggestions and adaptations from the earlier master-builders of verse. This fact does not need extended proof, but rather illustrations from which can be seen his psychic attitude and his poetic method. Adaptations from Ovid make up the first line of the poem, while the statement (*Metam.* 4, 617):

Cumque super Libycas victor penderet harenas,
Gorgonei capitis guttae cecidere cruentae,
Quas humus exceptas varios animavit in angues;
Unde frequens illa est infestaque terra colubris,

is expanded by Lucan (9, 619-699). The fight between Hercules and Antaeus is merely mentioned by Ovid (*Metam.* 9, 183), and may not have suggested the account in Lucan (4, 593-660). However, each can decide for himself in regard to the propriety of assigning the story to a *rudis incola* (*ib.* 592).

Vergil introduces Iopas as singer at the feast of Dido (*Aen.* 1, 740 ff.), and this suggested Acoreus telling of the sources of the Nile, but at much greater length (10, 194-331). Inasmuch as Aeneas received assistance from the Sibyl, it was eminently proper that Appius should consult the oracle at Delphi. The priestess *bacchatur . . . per antrum* (5, 169), just as the Sibyl *in antro bacchatur* (*Aen.* 6, 77). The answer of the priestess is more involved than that of the Sibyl, but properly interpreted foretold the death of Appius (*ib.* 196):

Effugis ingentes tanti discriminis expers
Bellorum, Romane, minas solusque quietem
Euboici vasta lateris convalle tenebis.

The scene might fitly end with this, but Lucan extends it with nearly forty lines chiding the god of prophecy.

More interesting than these suggested scenes are the little snatches of the song of other men which he has worked into the poem. These show the skill of the selector, and are a recognition of the merit of the originator. The incorporated parts were not out of harmony with the other parts. To use his own words there was no *concordia discors* (1, 98), and thus the

merit of the work of Lucan was proved. On two occasions (*Aen.* 2, 774; 3, 48) the hair of Aeneas stood on end—*steteruntque comae*—, and in the statement of the fact Vergil produced a marvel for orthodox grammarians, a short *e* in the ending of the perfect indicative. How neatly does Lucan improve on this (1, 193) with *riguere comae*! A part of Caesar's question (1, 345) *quae moenia fessis?* is what Aeneas asks of the gods (*Aen.* 3, 85). *Patuere doli* (4, 746; 5, 141) changes but one letter of Vergil's *latuere doli* (*Aen.* 1, 130). Lucan also has another variation (2, 1) *irae patuere deum*. Notice how nearly *pro lucri pallida tabes*! (4, 96) comes to, yet avoids, *auri sacra fames* (*Aen.* 3, 57). Pompey says *magna peregi* (5, 660), a suggestion from the words of Dido (*Aen.* 4, 653). The close resemblance of the following is worthy of note: *revocato sanguine* (8, 68) and *revocato a sanguine* (*Aen.* 1, 235); *quas gesserat olim* (9, 176) and *quod gesserat olim* (*Aen.* 1, 653). Compare also *accipe, numen . . . votorum extrema meorum* (8, 142) with (*Aen.* 3, 486):

*Accipe et haec, manuum tibi quae monumenta meorum
Sint cape dona extrema tuorum.*

The tone in Vergil's (*Aen.* 2, 354):

Una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem

is reproduced with variations in *una salus* (9, 379), *sola salus* (5, 575), as also in *spes una salutis* (2, 113; 5, 636). The words (3, 737):

*Ille caput labens et iam languentia colla
Viso patre levat,*

are suggested by the words of Vergil describing the death of Euryalus (*Aen.* 9, 435). The thought in *pati vel quae tristissima pulchrum | Romanumque putant*, strikes the same note as Vergil's *pulchrum mori* (*Aen.* 2, 317) and Horace's (*Odes* 3, 2, 13)

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

Aemula virtus (1, 121) is taken over from Horace (*Epodes* 16, 5), and there are a number of other adaptations, as, for example, *totus popularibus auris | Impelli* (1, 132), the negative of Horace (*Odes* 3, 2, 19-20):

Nec sumit aut ponit secures
Arbitrio popularis auræ.

The words (5, 37): *iacet hostis in undis* | *Obrutus Illyricis* is a transformation of *Odes* 1, 28, 23:

Illyricis Notus obruit undis,
just as the line (6, 75):

Distat ab excelsa nemoralis Aricia Roma
is suggested by *Sat.* 1, 5, 1:

Egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma.

The words of Horace (*Odes* 1, 1, 18): *indocilis pauperiem pati*, are for metrical reasons slightly changed (5, 538) *indocilis privata loqui*. Compare also (3, 510):

. . . Non robore picto
Ornatas decuit fulgens tutela carinas,

with *Odes* 1, 14, 14: *Nil pictis timidus navita puppibus* | *Fidit*. The words assigned to Pompey (8, 266) *Non omnis in arvis* | *Emathiis cecidi*, adapt the famous words of Horace (*Odes* 3, 30, 6) *non omnis moriar*. The above quotations are fully sufficient to show the method of Lucan, and that he felt the need of brightening his song with the words of other bards.

II. ADAPTATIONS OF LUCAN.

The epic poets who followed Lucan made ample use of his words. For Silius, as we have shown elsewhere (*Class. Phil.* XVII, 319) Lucan stands on a par with Vergil. Valerius Flaccus and Statius also used the *Pharsalia* freely, yet with a difference in their methods. The case is concisely summed up by Baehrens, *Praefatio*, Val. Flac., p. viii: "Talibus in aemulationibus nescio an nullus poeta Romanus prudentius et, ut ita dicam, pudenter sese gesserit Valerio. Alii enim, ut Silius Italicus, interdum nimis anxie ac timide, alii, ut Statius, nimis callide ac paene fraudulentè Vergilii vestigia presserunt; certe de Statio rectissime ipsius verbis [*Achill.* I 60] a viro docto nescioquo dictum est eum vulpis instar delevisse pedum vestigia caudis." Statius tells us that he watched over the *Thebaid* for twelve years. If he worked regularly throughout the entire

period, the work could have been completed by finishing a sentence a day. Compare the differentiated statement in *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (9, 15): *Toto anno, per omnes dies, magna noctium parte unum librum excudit et elucubravit.* Under these conditions, it was possible for Statius to so metamorphose the words of his predecessors that little trace of the original remained.

1. *Valerius Flaccus.*

The collection by Baehrens shows a Vergilian reminiscence for every ten lines of Flaccus, and in the earlier part of the work, there is the same free use of Lucan. At times a suggestion from Vergil seems to have been utilized by Lucan, and was in turn taken from the latter by Flaccus. Vergil has a simile (*Aen.* 10, 272 ff.) containing a reference to Sirius:

Non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
Sanguinei lugubre rubent aut Sirius ardor,
Ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris,
Nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.

Lucan has (10, 211) *rapidos qua Sirius ignes | Exerit*, while Flaccus adapts the same simile (1, 683 ff.; 5, 368 ff.), the latter passage having *asperat ignes | Sirius*, an adaptation of Lucan. Similar statements are also found elsewhere. The *Aeneid* begins with *cano*, but both Lucan and Flaccus have *canimus*. The words *praesaga mali mens* (*Aen.* 10, 843) are differently arranged and are placed by Flaccus at the beginning of the line (1, 693). In its association with *metus* it resembles the form in Lucan (9, 120): *in multo mens est praesaga timore*. Compare also *ferit retinacula ferro* (*Aen.* 4, 580), *abscidis frustra ferro tua pignora* (L. 3, 33) and *retinacula ferro | Abscidit* (Fl. 1, 488); *premit altum corde dolorem* (*Aen.* 1, 209); *prementem | corde metus ducit* (Fl. 1, 733); and *premit inde metus* (L. 7, 341).

The earlier use of some proper names by Lucan accounts for their appearance in Flaccus, as *Aricia* (L. 6, 75; Fl. 2, 305), *Inarime* (L. 5, 101; Fl. 3, 208), *Sesostris* (L. 10, 276; Fl. 5, 418). Compare also the reference to *Pallas* (L. 7, 149 ff.; Fl. 6, 173 ff.), and the names in L. 6, 388 ff. and Fl. 3, 65-66. Some adjective forms are also noticeable, *Inachius* (L. 4, 634;

Fl. 4, 397). In Lucan (7, 116) the Enipeus is *turbidus*, in Flaccus (1, 83) *tumidus*. Gortyna sagittis (L. 3, 186) is like Gortyna pharetris (Fl. 1, 708), as are the references to Peuce (L. 3, 202; Fl. 8, 217), and to Rhodope (L. 7, 450; Fl. 1, 728). Both writers mention the Caspia claustra (L. 8, 222; Fl. 5, 122), and non euri cessasse minas (L. 5, 608) is akin to cessante euro (Fl. 3, 483).

The similar or identical portions in the two poems are apparently used for metrical reasons, and need only some illustrations. Vires . . . retentat (L. 4, 723) suggested irasque retentant (Fl. 3, 97), just as ad aequoreas . . . undas (L. 1, 401) did et aequoreos divos (Fl. 1, 139). Compare also artus | Alligat . . . torpor (L. 4, 290) and sopor alligat artus (Fl. 1, 48). Longer passages are sometimes identical, as gravido Cynthia cornu (L. 1, 218; Fl. 2, 56) and longi . . . praemia belli (L. 1, 341; Fl. 2, 114); and sometimes varied, as longis producere noctem | Adloquiis (L. 10, 173): adloquiis . . . educite noctem (Fl. 1, 251); cunctas super ardua turris | Eminent (L. 4, 431): planctus super eminent omnes (Fl. 1, 317); Chaos . . . confundere mundos (L. 6, 696): Chaos . . . consumere mundum (Fl. 1, 832); dum sanguis inerat, dum vis materna (L. 2, 338): dum vires utero maternaque sufficit aetas (Fl. 2, 325); spissis avellitur uncus harenis (L. 2, 694): legitur piger uncus harenis (Fl. 2, 428). Notice the statement of Lucan (3, 199):

Deseritur Strymon tepido committere Nilo
Bistonias consuetus aves et barbara Cone,

which is reversed in the simile of Flaccus (3, 359):

. . . qualiter Arctos
Ad patrias avibus medio iam vere revectis
Memphis et aprici statio silet annua Nili.

One line in Lucan (2, 716):

Cyaneas tellus emisit in aequora cautes,

suggested a line for Flaccus (1, 59; cf. 7, 41):

Conticuit certas Scythico concurrere ponto | Cyaneas,

while Statius wrote with an eye to both (*Th.* 11, 438):

Pontus Cyaneos vetuit concurrere montes,
and (*Silv.* 1, 2, 40) . . . si Cyaneos raperere per aestus.

2. *Statius.*

There are numerous indications of the utilization of the words of Lucan by Statius, though the object was adaptation rather than reproduction. It may be held that the latter applies more to the *Silvae*; the former to the *Thebaid*. We find in Lucan (7, 482) Pangaeaque saxa resultant, which is nearly repeated in *Silv.* 1, 2, 223 Pangaea resultant, and at a further remove, *Th.* 2, 714 iuga longa resultant. Similar to this is 2, 716, *supra*. Statius has one poem (*Silv.* 2, 7) *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam* in which one line (23): Romani colitur chori sacerdos, suggests that Lucan is another Horace; see Horace (*Odes* 4, 3, 23): Romanae fidicen lyrae. But more complimentary than original praise applied to Lucan is the use of a thought from Lucan himself (v. 90):

O saevae nimium gravesque Parcae!
O numquam data longa fata summis!

a variation of Lucan (1, 70):

Invida fatorum series summisque negatum
Stare diu.

Statius seems to have regarded Lucan as a master in fixing geographical appellations. Lucan (1, 600):

Et lotam parvo revocant Almone Cybeben

accounts for the same association (*Silv.* 5, 1, 223): . . . Italo gemitus Almone Cybebe | Ponit. Variation is shown (*Silv.* 1, 3, 33):

Bruttia Sicanium circumspicit ora Pelorum,

which, though differing in form, is based on Lucan's words (2, 438):

Extremi colles Siculo cessere Peloro.

The crowded lines of Lucan (3, 214):

Accedunt Syriae populi, desertus Orontes

Et felix, sic fama, Ninos, ventosa Damascos
 Gazaque et arbusto palmarum dives Idume
 Et Tyros instabilis pretiosaque murice Sidon,

may be compared with the passage (*Silv.* 3, 2, 136 ff.) containing

. . . dulce nemus florentis Idumes;
 Quo pretiosa Tyros rubeat, quo purpura fuco
 Sidoniis iterata cadis.

In the simile of 7, 144 *incudibus* and *aegida* have the same position as in the simile of *Silv.* 3, 1, 130 ff. Other illustrations are: *gelidas ad Phasidos undas* (2, 585): *gelidi non Phasidis ales* (*Silv.* 2, 4, 27); *praecipitis superaverat Anxuris arces* (3, 84): *arcesque superbae | Anxuris* (*Silv.* 1, 3, 86); *Adriaco tellus circumflua ponto* (4, 407; cf. 10, 476): *undoso circumflua coniuge Peuce* (*Silv.* 5, 2, 137), a transfer being made from the Adriatic to the Danube; *Et Pelusiaci tam mollis turba Canopi* (8, 543): *Tu Pelusiaci scelus Canopi* (*Silv.* 2, 7, 70), *Saxosa Carystos* (5, 232) is repeated in *Th.* 7, 370 but *undosa* is used *Silv.* 1, 5, 34.

A few salient examples of the adaptation of other terms will also be given. Lucan has *visceribus lassis* (2, 340) in speaking of Marcia, and this accounts for *visceribus totis* in a similar account (*Silv.* 5, 1, 47). *Solacia fati . . . tulit* (2, 91), and similarly *magna feram solacia mortis* (8, 314) suggested *magna . . . solatia leti . . . feres* (*Silv.* 2, 5, 24), while *flammigeros axes* (*Silv.* 4, 3, 136; cf. 1, 2, 119; 3, 1, 181) is an apparent variation from Lucan's *flammigeros . . . currus* (1, 48). *Vergentibus annis | In senium* (1, 129): *vergimur in senium* (*Silv.* 4, 4, 70), and also in *senium vergens* (*Th.* 1, 391); *Acherontis adusti* (3, 16): with reference to the same, *adusta . . . litora* (*Silv.* 2, 1, 187); *taxus opacat* (6, 645): *opacat | Arbor* (*Silv.* 2, 3, 1); *mercis mutator eoae* (8, 854): *plagae viridis regnator eoae* (*Silv.* 2, 4, 25); *calcabatur onyx* (10, 117): *calcabam . . . opes* (*Silv.* 1, 3, 53). *Tanta oblivio mentis* (10, 403) is akin to *pigra oblivio vitae* (*Silv.* 1, 4, 57); cf. *desidis otia vitae ib.* 3, 5, 85. Compare also the use of *ophites* (9, 714; *Silv.* 1, 5, 35). We shall take the occurrences of *lanugo* to close this section. Statius has it (*Th.* 7, 655) *crescunt lanugine malae*;

(*Th.* 9, 703) nondum mutatae rosea lanugine malae, but more noticeable is Lucan's (10, 135):

Vix ulla fuscante tamen lanugine malas,

two words of which are used by Statius in one passage (*Silv.* 3, 4, 65):

. . . ne prima genas lanugo nitentes
Carperet et pulchrae fuscaret gratia formae.

The material from Lucan utilized in the *Thebaid* ranges from a single word to statements of some length preserving the same meaning and enough of a similar structure to indicate its source. Of the first we give only *maiestate* (3, 430: *Th.* 1, 209), and *terrigenae* (4, 553: *Th.* 4, 441). Two words are frequently retained in the same position, and sometimes in the identical form, as Iunonis iniquae (1, 576: *Th.* 3, 184), furialibus armis (1, 200: *Th.* 11, 90), manifesta fides (1, 524: *Th.* 6, 638), amisere notas (2, 167: *Th.* 5, 549), ingestis . . . telis (6, 232: *Th.* 10, 860), Eoo | Cardine (5, 71: *Th.* 1, 158), ora redundant (9, 812: *Th.* 10, 320), ignis edax (9, 742: *Th.* 12, 430). Here also may belong cervice recisa (9, 214: *Th.* 10, 516), though *remissa* is also read in the latter passage. Occasionally there is a necessary variation in form, as in eiectat saniem (3, 658): eiectans saniem (*Th.* 9, 101); infecta . . . herba (7, 851): infectas . . . herbas (*Th.* 5, 590); astriferis . . . axibus (9, 5): astriferos . . . axes (*Th.* 8, 83). At times there is a change in the order of the words, e. g. O numinis instar (1, 199): instar mihi numinis (*Th.* 10, 361), dies . . . | Exoritur (1, 232): Exoritur . . . dies (*Th.* 5, 296); tacitas . . . fraudes (4, 465): fraude . . . tacita (*Th.* 10, 721).

In many a passage in Statius one word from Lucan is retained and the accompanying term is varied, but still bears a close resemblance in form or in pronunciation to the associated term in Lucan. Illustrations of such changes are exanguis . . . senectus (1, 343): exsanguis . . . anni (11, 323); mentesque tepescunt (4, 284): unguis . . . tepescunt (*Th.* 1, 611); urbis amatae (1, 508): telluris amatae (*Th.* 7, 156); fallaci . . . sereno (1, 530): fallaci . . . limo (*Th.* 9, 475); convicia festa (2, 369): certamina festa (*Th.* 6, 924); rore madentis (4, 316): madentes . . . imbre (*Th.* 5, 597); iuventus . . . Taygeti (5,

51): Taygetique phalanx (*Th.* 4, 227); aere non pigro (6, 107): niger . . . aer (*Th.* 4, 584); Meleagream . . . Calydon (6, 365): Meleagria . . . Calydon (*Th.* 4, 103); in Tartareo . . . antro (6, 712): Tartarei . . . barathri (*Th.* 1, 85); funereae . . . mensae (6, 557): funereas . . . dapes (*Th.* 4, 307); rapidus Ganges (8, 227): marcidus Ganges (*Th.* 12, 788); compare tumido me gurgite Ganges (2, 496): tumidum Gangen (*Th.* 4, 387); illicitosque toros (10, 76): nec Venerem illicitam (*Th.* 8, 96); igne superiecto (10, 215): imbre superiecto (*Th.* 3, 251).

Groups of three words are of frequent occurrence and show the same phases. The permeation of the method throughout the entire work of Statius is indicated by the following selected examples: Sed nocte sopora (2, 236): sub nocte sopora (*Th.* 1, 403); permixto libamina Baccho (4, 198): tepidi libamina sacri (*Th.* 1, 513); nulla tonitrua durant (7, 479): rauca tonitrua pulsan (*Th.* 2, 40); foeda situ macies (6, 516): aegra solo macies (*Th.* 4, 702); turbo rapax . . . vela (5, 595): turbo rapax . . . saxa (*Th.* 4, 820); fractisque modestior annis (8, 476): cunctante modestior ira (*Th.* 5, 680); perfida . . . inconstantia veris (5, 415): hiberno par inconstantia ponto (*Th.* 6, 306); mentimur regnare Iovem (7, 447): Bacchum haut mentimur alumnum (*Th.* 7, 667); longa . . . ieiunia belli (3, 282): longae . . . ieiunia poenae (*Th.* 8, 255); siccae sulcator harenae (4, 588); sulcator pallidus undae (*Th.* 8, 18), and pigri sulcator Averni (*Th.* 11, 588); remanet pallorque rigorque (6, 759): abiit horrorque vigorque (*Th.* 10, 641); Balearis verberare fundae (1, 229): fundae Balearis habenas (*Th.* 10, 857). The last is a noticeable group, as the use of this sling lay outside of the sphere of the actors in the *Thebaid*. Magnoque exaestuat igne (5, 173): miseraque exaestuat ira (*Th.* 11, 297); Vos, quae Nilo mutare soletis | Threicias hiemes . . . Istis aves (7, 832): frigora solvere Nilo (*Th.* 12, 518).

Longer groups are fairly common, and the material which was adapted was drawn from all parts of the *Pharsalia*.

Ferrea belligeri compescat limina Iani (1, 62)

furnished *ferrea* and *limina* for (*Th.* 8, 56):

Ferrea Cerbereae tacuerunt limina portae;

while of *Commodat* . . . *Invidiam Fortuna suam* (1, 83) only the verb appears in *commodat iras* | *cuncta cohors* (*Th.* 4, 75). *Machina* . . . *mundi* (1, 80) appears as *machina caeli* (*Th.* 8, 310), but the accompanying statement in the *Thebaid* has *mundi* | *Robur inoccidui*, a variation from Lucan (8, 175) *axis inocciduus*. The thought in the declaration of Lucan (1, 92):

*Nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
Inpatiens consortis erit,*

is reflected in *Th.* 1, 127 ff. with *regendi*, *inpatiens* and *sociis*. Compare the geographical information in Lucan (1, 101) . . . *et geminum gracilis mare separat Isthmos*, with *Th.* 1, 120 . . . *et geminis vix fluctibus obstitit Isthmos*. The words addressed to Caesar, *Livor edax tibi omnia negat*, is practically reversed in the final statement of Statius (*Th.* 12, 818). The belief expressed in *terris mutantem regna cometen* (1, 529) is repeated in *quae mutant sceptrum cometarum* (*Th.* 1, 708). Other examples are *curis animum mordacibus angit* (2, 681): *magnanimum stimulis urgentibus angunt* (*Th.* 6, 827); *mediisque sedent convallibus arva* (3, 380): *mediae ponunt convallibus Ossae* (*Th.* 2, 83). . . . *Emicuit per mille foramina sanguis* | *impius* (*Th.* 12, 776) in brevity at least improves the words of Lucan (3, 638):

. . . *nec sicut volnere sanguis
Emicuit lentus: ruptis cadit undique venis.*

Vergil has (*Aen.* 3, 659):

Trunca manu pinus regit, et vestigia firmat,

from which Lucan (4, 41) drew *fixo firmat vestigia pilo*, and Statius may have followed either one (*Th.* 2, 11) *et medica firmat vestigia virga*. The first part of *si sanguine prisco* | *Robur inest animis* (5, 17) is reproduced in *de sanguine prisco* | *Nobilitas* (*Th.* 3, 600), but *nobilitas* takes the place of three words in Lucan. Compare (4, 814):

Haud alium tanta civem tulit indole Roma,

with (*Th.* 2, 631) *nil indole clarius illa* | *Nec pietate fuit*. *Iam vos ego nomine vero* | *Eliciam* (6, 732) is neatly turned in *post vos ego gurgite pleno* | *Eliciam* (*Th.* 4, 693). *Rarus vacuis*

habitor in arvis (*Th.* 4, 150), and inarata diu Pangaea (*Th.* 10, 512) are based on the words of Lucan (1, 25-26):

Rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat
Horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos
Hesperia.

How far the *Pharsalia* may have furnished suggestions for the *Thebaid* can not be determined. The fact stated in nulli sua profuit aetas (2, 104 ff.) is repeated in entirely different words following furor omnibus idem (*Th.* 5, 148 ff.). The simile (1, 674) beginning

Nam qualis vertice Pindi
Edonis Ogygio decurrit plena Lyaeo,

is retouched and expanded (*Th.* 12, 785 ff.), the words *Ogygiae* and *decurrunt* alone indicating the origin. The forest described by Lucan (3, 440) has some of the same trees mentioned by Statius (*Th.* 6, 90-106), and *fluctibus aptior alnus* seem to have suggested *alnus amica fretis*. In some of these there is scant resemblance, yet as the touch, Statius (*Th.* 2, 731)

. . . et flavo tollens ubi vertice pontum
Turbidus obiectas Achelous Echinadas exit,

certainly came from Lucan (6, 363):

et tuus, Oeneu,
Paene gener crassis oblimat Echinadas undis,

it can be seen how nearly he succeeded in producing an apparently new creation out of the material of Lucan. It would be needless to try to determine how far he has really succeeded in doing this. One can rest with the presentation of enough material to show that Statius adapted the material of Lucan as skilfully and almost as frequently as he did that of Vergil.

3. *Martial.*

Martial, like Statius (*Silv.* 2, 7), praised Lucan in poems addressed to Polla (7, 21-23; 10, 64). The same attitude of the two writers is indicated by several equivalent strains: M. Haec est illa dies: S. Vestra est ista dies; M. Lucanum populis

. . . dedit: S. Lucanum potes inputare terris; M. Nero crudelis: S. Ingratus Nero; M. Aonidum turba, favete sacris: S. Favete linguis . . . favete, Musae; M. bella tonanti: S. bella detonabis; M. colas: S. colit; and perhaps M. Heliconis gloria nostri: S. Romani . . . chori sacerdos. Taking this material into consideration we should expect to find that Martial made use of Lucan, just as did Statius, but not to any great extent. The shifting panorama of Martial is so unlike the epic pageantry of Lucan that there is little requiring a like coloring. The frequency of some geographical terms in Lucan may account for them in Martial, as *Niliacus*, 10, 14, 6. The association of the tigress with Hyrcania (L. 1, 328: M. 8, 26, 2; *Spect.* 18, 2) may be a common conventionality. *Caledonios* . . . *Britannos* (L. 6, 68: M. 10, 44, 1) have the same position in the line, and *barbara Memphis* (L. 8, 542: M. 8, 36, 2) stand together though separated *Spect.* 1, 1. *Lauriferos* . . . *currus* (L. 5, 332) begin and end the line, as do *laurigeros* . . . *penates* (M. 8, 1, 1). The statement *non ulla fuit iusti reverentia* (L. 9, 192) is reversed in *tanta tibi est recti reverentia*, Caesar (M. 11, 5, 1), while *dedidicit iam pace ducem* (L. 1, 131) may have suggested the combination *dedidicit pacem* (M. 2, 75, 3). If the words were found in the same connection in Statius we could justly hold that *invidiosa* (L. 8, 394: *Spect.* 2, 3), *venerabile* (L. 8, 855: *Spect.* 2, 5), and *subitus* (L. 6, 598: *Spect.* 14, 4) were drawn from the lines of Lucan. But the usual for Statius is the unusual for Martial, and some of the above may mean only independent use of the same terms.

III. PROSE ADAPTATIONS.

The discussion of the influence of Lucan on prose writers may well start from the statement (*Dialogus de Oratoribus* 20, 18): *Exigitur enim iam ab oratore etiam poeticus decor, non Accii aut Pacuvii veterino inquinatus, sed ex Horatii et Vergilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus*. Had Lucan risen to such prominence as a writer within the few years that had followed his death? Or is the statement true for the later period of authorship, or is *et Lucani* a later addition to the texts. The use of three names violates the almost uniform practice of the writer in giving but two (cf. 23, 7 ff.), just as he did doubled synonyms.

Was the phraseology of the *Dialogus* influenced by that of the *Pharsalia*? Of this there is little evidence. The metaphorical expression in *arcem eloquentiae* (10, 20) is not unlike Lucan's *arcem iuris* (7, 593), while it is so used by Statius (*Silv.* 2, 2, 131) and Silius Italicus (13, 771), and is found as early as Livy (28, 42, 16): *ubi Hannibal sit, ibi caput atque arcem huius belli*. *Statio* in *cum statione peracta* | *Astra petes serus* (1, 45) has the same meaning as we think it should have in D. 17, 15 (see *A. J. P.* XVII, 55). *Finierat* (L. 10, 193: D. 17, 15) is used in the same way by Ovid, and, if the immediate influence of any writer may be assumed for the *Dialogus*, it may well be that of Quintilian. The same is true of *hirta toga* (L. 2, 386: D. 26, 5: Quint. 12, 10, 47). This may also be true of *excedere modum* (L. 2, 142: D. 41, 18). Lucan (1, 67) appropriates *expromere causas* from Ovid, and either writer may be the source for the *Dialogus* (24, 12). The collocation *nemora et luci* (9, 33; 12, 1; cf. Tac. *Germ.* 45, 23 *nemora lucosque*) is not exactly parallel to Lucan (1, 453) *nemora alta remotis* | *Incolitis lucis*, which seems to be an adaptation of Sen. *Oet.* 961: *nemoris sacri* | *lucos tenetis*. *Nomen popolare* (L. 7, 694: D. 36, 10), and (L. 6, 780):

Effera Romanos agitat discordia manes,

and *domestica discordia agitat* (D. 41, 5) are the same. One phrase in Lucan (6, 59)

*Aut aliquem mundi, quamvis natura negasset,
In melius mutare locum,*

has the same subject as *quibus natura sua oratorium ingenium denegavit* (D. 10, 10), and the same construction as Tac. *Ann.* 11, 20, 9 *quamvis bellum negavisset*; cf. (*ib.* 15, 42, 6) *quibus ingenium et audacia erat, etiam quae natura denegavisset*. With the exception of the last the examples are not very striking, and seem to indicate only the possibility of the utilization of the *Pharsalia* in the *Dialogus*.

Tacitus

There is very little in common between the vocabulary of Lucan and that of Tacitus, and a comparison of extended sections of the *Annals* and *Histories* with the *Pharsalia* does not

reveal any necessary connection. Vergil (*Aen.* 10, 745) has *olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urguet* | *Somnus*, which is adapted by Lucan (7, 26 f.):

*Crastina dira quies et imagine maesta diurna
Undique funestas acies feret, undique bellum.*

Tacitus (*Ann.* 1, 65, 5) has the words *dira quies*, but with an entirely different meaning, *ducemque terruit dira quies*. *Securus veniae* (L. 8, 784) or *s. belli* (*ib.* 5, 526) or *s. pugnae* (*ib.* 4, 534) may have suggested *potentiae securus* (*Ann.* 3, 28, 7), and other similar associations, *odii* (*Agr.* 43, 13), *dedecoris* (*H.* 3, 41, 12), and *casuum* (*H.* 1, 76, 11). *Spargatque per aequora bellum* (L. 2, 682) retains the construction of Vergil (*Aen.* 7, 551); cf. *armaque late* | *Spargit* (L. 6, 269). Tacitus uses *bellum* (*Agr.* 38, 12; *Ann.* 3, 21, 13). Silius Italicus has the same expression in 9, 277. In imitation of Horace (*Odes* 3, 13, 14) *Me dicente*, Lucan has *Me reticente* (6, 813) and Tacitus the same participle (*Ann.* 11, 27, 3). *Spectatrix scelestum* (L. 3, 129) is akin to *spectator flagitii* (*H.* 1, 56, 1). The verb *determinat* (L. 1, 216; 9, 957; *Ann.* 11, 10, 8) is not of frequent occurrence, yet is occasionally found in Pliny the Elder. Reminiscences of Horace and of Vergil are part of the warp and woof of the style of Tacitus, but there are not such indications of the use of the *Pharsalia* as are to be found in the later epic poems.

IV. ELEMENTS OF APPEAL.

1. Geographic.

The time covered by the poem is brief, but the geographic panorama stretches from Massilia to Egypt. When we bear in mind that Pomponius Mela, one of the uncles of Lucan, was an authority on geography and that another, the philosopher Seneca, had written a work on Egypt, we are not surprised that he dealt freely in such details. The places from which came the cohorts of Caesar (1, 396-446), the corresponding section about the Appennines and the rivers of Italy (2, 396-437), the places from which were drawn the forces of Pompey (3, 169-295), and the description of Thessaly and its rivers (6, 333-394), interesting as they may have been to the actors, lack the

distinguishing features which Vergil gave to his places by the skillful use of adjectives. Similar to these are the account of Africa, and of the grove at Massilia. In itself Africa had nothing susceptible of poetic decoration, so Lucan used his skill in a portrayal of its serpents. Nearly two hundred lines are taken up in describing them, so that he must have been satisfied with their rhythmic glidings, as in (9, 631):

. . . illis e faucibus angues
Stridula fuderunt vibratis sibila linguis.

I wonder if, when Lucan recited the poem, his audience could hear the serpentine glidings in the hexameter, as in (9, 709):

Squamiferos ingens haemorrhoids explicat orbes;

or (*ib.* 723):

Ossaque dissolvens cum corpore tabificus seps,
Sibilaque effundens cunctas terrentia pestes;

or (*ib.* 828):

Quid prodest miseri basiliscus cuspidē Murri
Transactus?

Far different is the grove (3, 399-452). It was consecrated by barbarian rites, and beasts and birds feared to enter, though dragons found a refuge there. But it was soon destroyed after Caesar with his ax struck a majestic tree, and said (*ib.* 436):

Iam ne quis vestrum dubitet subvertere silvam,
Credite me fecisse nefas.

2. *Ethical.*

The gods were dead, and the whole ethical background is different from that in Vergil. The word *fatum*, singular or plural, is used some 250 times, and *fortuna* 150. Yet they had fallen from their high estate as designations of determining influences for men. They were no longer the controllers, but the controlled of men. *Invidia factorum series* (1, 70) is the current of historical events. In the line (2, 65):

Oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectae,

we have the natural burdens of old age, and (4, 769) *fatum miserabile belli* is similar. Judged by the principles of Cato, his words (2, 287):

Sed quo fata trahunt, virtus secura sequetur,

was an act of free will under natural conditions. There is mere conventionality in the words of Pompey (7, 705):

Crede deis, longo fatorum crede favori.

The color of *fortuna* is the same. The success of Caesar in cutting down the grove, calls out the comment (3, 448):

. . . Servat multos fortuna nocentes,
Et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt.

Notice also the words (7, 547): *fortunaque Caesaris haesit*. *Fors* and *casus* are indeterminable, as is stated in (2, 12):

Sive nihil positum est, sed fors incerta vagatur
Fertque refertque vices, et habet mortalia casus.

Lucan looked upon his subject as an exhibition of human activity and used conventional terms to indicate the causes which he could not trace.

3. Characters.

The greatest characters in the poem are Caesar and Pompey and Cato, though not *longo sed proximus intervallo*, and Lucan is at his best in the delineation of these. Caesar is made to claim that he was feared (5, 668 ff.) as if he were such a one as the typical tyrant portrayed by the Romans:

Mihi funere nullo
Est opus, O superi; lacerum retinete cadaver
Fluctibus in mediis, desint mihi busta rogosque
Dum metuar semper terraque expecter ab omni.

But he is better known from the dynamic simile (1, 151 ff.):

Qualiter expressum ventis per nubila fulmen
Aetheris impulsu sonitu mundique fragore
Emicuit rupitque diem populosque paventes
Terruit obliqua praestringens lumina flamma;

In sua templa furit, nullaue exire vetante
Materia, magnamque cadens magnamque revertens
Dat stragem late sparsosque recolligit ignes.

It matters little that *emicuit* was suggested by Vergil's line (*Aen.* 5, 319):

Emicat, et ventis et fulminis ocior alis.

Equally good yet entirely different is the picture of Pompey (1, 135):

Stat magni nominis umbra;
Qualis frugifero quercus sublimis in agro
Exuvias veteris populi sacrataque gestans
Dona ducum nec iam validis radicibus haerens
Pondere fixa suo est, nudosque per aera ramos
Effundens trunco, non frondibus, efficit umbram;
Et quamvis primo nutet casura sub euro,
Tot circum silvae firmo se robore tollant,
Sola tamen colitur.

The last act expressed by *nutet* is the last of the *ornus* in Vergil (*Aen.* 2, 629) just before its fall, but Lucan does not anticipate.

For Cato he has lines equally fitting (1, 125):

Nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem
Pompeiusve parem. Quis iustius induit arma,
Scire nefas; magno se iudice quisque tuetur:
Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni.

If there are traces of Vergilian picturing in the sketches of Caesar and Pompey, may there not be Horatian philosophy in this, *scire nefas* being an adaptation of *nec scire fas est omnia* (*Odes* 4, 4, 22). However the greatest praise of Cato is that he was the guiding-star of Brutus (2, 247): *Dux Bruto Cato solus erit*. But he is best known by the famous characterization beginning (2, 380):

. . . Hi mores, haec duri inmota Catonis
Secta fuit, servare modum finesque tenere
Naturamque sequi patriaeque inpendere vitam
Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo.

If three short sketches incomparably drawn were a test of sustained poetic power, a place might be claimed for Lucan among the greatest. But there are no other figures comparable to these, and there are many scenes into which the poet has not succeeded in breathing the breath of poetic life. *Transfuga vilis* suffices as an epithet for Labienus (5, 346), and besides there is given his unsuccessful plea for consulting the oracle (9, 550-563). Appius is introduced merely to justify a discussion of prophecy (5, 67-236). This parsimony in presenting lesser characters left the view of the greater unobscured, and this is well if we assume the correctness of the characterization by Caesar (1, 313):

Marcellusque loquax, et, nomina vana, Catones.

4. *Orationes.*

Portraying the deeds of men without religious impulses, and of a society plunged in luxury, Lucan sought to brighten his poem by the introduction of speeches, of poetical figures, and of an occasional excursus. The judgment of Quintilian (10, 1, 90) that Lucan is better suited for orators than for poets is supported by the fact that more than one-fourth of the *Pharsalia* is given up to speeches. Intended to direct or to persuade, they deal with a wide range of activities, and present varying motives to arouse to action. From a rhetorical standpoint they would repay a careful examination, but as poetical elements, *a paucis, omnes disce*. The words of Cato (2, 301) are true to life:

Non ante revellar,
Exanimem quam te complectar, Roma, tuumque
Nomen, libertas, et inanem persequar umbram,

and (9, 581):

Sortilegis egeant dubii semperque futuris
Casibus ancipites; me non oracula certum,
Sed mors certa facit: pavido fortique cadendum est.
Hoc satis est dixisse Iovem.

The appeal of Pompey to his soldiers (2, 531-595) begins:

O scelerum ultores melioraque signa secuti,
O vere Romana manus, quibus arma senatus
Non privata dedit, votis deposcite pugnam,

and, especially in the latter part, well illustrates *magni nominis umbra*, as he pictures his own past:

Pars mundi mihi nulla vacat; sed tota tenetur
Terra meis, quocumque iacet sub sole, tropaeis.

His remarks on the field at Pharsalia are fashioned after the same pattern (7, 342-382). There is an imperative at the beginning, *totas effundite vires*, the laudation of self in the middle, *toto simul utimur orbe*, the appeal at the end:

ultima fata
Deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos,
Ne discam servire senex.

Later he encourages Cornelia (8, 84): *vivit post proelia Magnus* | *Sed fortuna perit*, and, when he was pierced by the sword of Achilles, dying, he approves of himself (8, 622 ff.):

Sum tamen, O superi, felix, nullique potestas
Hoc auferre deo. Mutantur prospera vita:
Non fit morte miser.

There is a touch of Vergilian color about Caesar's address to his soldiers (1, 299-351). It begins and ends as if they were the chief factors:

'Bellorum, O socii, qui mille pericula Martis
Mecum' ait 'experti decimo iam vincitis anno,'
.
. . . 'neque numina derunt;
'Nam neque praeda meis neque regnum quaeritur armis:
Detrahimus dominos urbi servire paratae.'

Conditions are as if Hannibal were descending from the Alps, and the thirst of Pompey is like that of the fierce tigress. The purported speech at Pharsalia (7, 250-329) is a creation by Lucan. It studiously avoids saying what Caesar records that he said; see *Bell. Civ.* 3, 90. A few touches are noticeable.

Nil opus est votis, iam fatum accersite ferro,
.
Conspicio faciesque truces oculosque minaces:

Vicistis. Videor fluvios spectare cruoris
 Calcatosque simul reges sparsumque senatus
 Corpus et immensa populos in caede natantis.

Well for Caesar that he was a better general than was Lucan a creator of speeches, for the speech ends:

Sternite iam vallum fossasque inplete ruina,
 Exeat ut plenis acies non sparsa manipulis.
 Parcite ne castris: vallo tendetis in illo,
 Unde acies peritura venit.

The poet suiting the actions of the soldiers to his own words continues:

Capiunt praesagia belli
 Calcatisque ruunt castris, stant ordine nullo
 Arte ducis nulla permittuntque omnia fatis.

Perrin (*A. J. P. V*, 325) shows the improbability of any such disorganized movement, and makes it clear that the poet was drawing on his imagination. At this awful moment can aught postpone the fatal clash that shall decide the fate of the world? Yes. A discourse of 75 lines showing the effect of the battle on mankind.

5. *The Simile.*

The simile is a noticeable feature in the *Pharsalia*. Not satisfied with placing two objects side by side so that the image may be intensified, Lucan develops each feature until the object in the simile stands out as if it were a separate picture drawn for its own sake. This can be seen by looking at a few in different parts of his work. His thesis (1, 68 ff.) closes with the words *nec se Roma ferens*, but this is forgotten in the picture which follows:

Sic, cum conpage soluta
 Saecula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora,
 Anticum repetens iterum chaos, omnia mixtim
 Sidera sideribus concurrent, ignea pontum
 Astra petent tellus extendere littora nolet
 Excutietque fretum, fratri contraria Phoebe
 Ibit et, oblicum bigas agitare per orbem
 Indignata, diem poscet sibi, totaque discors
 Machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi.

This is an example of his earlier work, but the type persisted, as is shown by 4, 549, where he wishes to illustrate *totum . . . bellorum fecere nefas*. To do this he draws the picture:

Sic semine Cadmi

Emicuit Dircaea cohors ceciditque suorum
Volneribus dirum Thebanis fratribus omen;
Phasidos et campis insomni dente creati
Terrigenae missa magicis e cantibus ira
Cognato tantos inplerunt sanguine sulcos,
Ipsaque, inexpertis quod primum fecerat herbis,
Expavit Medea nefas.

Vergil (*Aen.* 1, 430-436) and Milton (*P. L.* 1, 768-775) show men or angels working as do the bees. But compare with these the description by Lucan (9, 283 ff.):

Dixit et omnes

Haud aliter medio revocavit ab aequore puppes,
Quam simul effetas linquunt examina ceras
Atque oblita favi non miscent nexibus alas,
Sed sibi quaeque volat nec iam degustat amarum
Desidiosa thymum: Phrygii sonus increpat aeris,
Attonitae posuere fugam studiumque laboris
Floriferi repetunt et sparsi mellis amorem;
Gaudet in Hyblaeo securus gramine pastor
Divitias servasse casae: sic voce Catonis
Inculcata viris iusti patientia Martis.

These three show the plan of development that was followed even in the case of well-known objects, as the oak (1, 135), the lion (1, 205), the wind (2, 454), the bull (2, 601), and the hunter (4, 437). This development, over-development if you will, has this defect that it obscures the main object and makes the object in the simile seem to be the most important.

6. *The Excursus.*

A noteworthy excursus is that describing the feast of Cleopatra (10, 107-333) in which occurs the recital of Acoreus. It was a scene

“. . . where the gorgeous East with richest hand
Show'rs on her kings barbaric pearl and gold,”

and to its completeness only one touch is lacking—the dissolving of pearls in wine. Here also may be placed the entire account of the African campaign which had no bearing on the decision of the main question.

7. *Political.*

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are political, rather than poetical elements, yet they can be made the basis of a perpetual appeal to men, and it will not be a fruitless task to show what other generations may find in Lucan's deliverances on these subjects. At times he suits his words to the characters whom he introduces, yet his own views are made fairly clear in the reflections scattered through the poem. Lucan inveighed against, and no doubt enjoyed, the luxury of his day. Yet it is to this that he refers the ethical conditions which made the Civil War possible. Notice his delineation of the age (1, 158 ff) :

. . . suberant sed publica belli
Semina, quæ populos semper mersere potentes.
Namque ut opes nimias mundo fortuna subacto
Intulit, et rebus mores cessere secundis,
Praedaque et hostiles luxum suasere rapinae,
Non auro tectisve modus, mensasque priores
Aspernata fames . . . fecunda virorum
Paupertas fugitur, totoque accersitur orbe,
Quo gens quaeque perit.

The apostrophe (4, 373 ff.) is also worthy of note :

O prodiga rerum
Luxuries numquam parvo contenta paratis
Et quaesitorum terra pelagoque ciborum
Ambitiosa fames et lautae gloria mensae,
Discite, quam parvo liceat producere vitam,
Et quantum natura petat.

The sole consolation (10, 110) was that the luxury of Egypt had not yet been transferred to Rome, although it too enjoyed the things sought throughout the entire world (*ib.* 157). Yet in the cottage there is no booty to be found during civil wars (5, 526) ;

praedam civilibus armis
 Scit non esse casas. O vitae tuta facultas
 Pauperis angustique lares! O munera nondum
 Intellecta deum!

But more than any rhetorical expressions, the words *animas viles* (5, 683; 7, 730) show the low value that was set on the lives of common men.

Lucan pictures the political situation with the words (7, 433):

Libertas ultra Tigrim Rhenumque recessit.

The view assigned to Pompey is interesting (7, 695): *sed par, quod semper habemus, | Libertas et Caesar erit*. Lucan felt that Cato lived not after liberty, nor liberty after Cato, and that *licentia ferri* (1, 8) held sway. His is the statement (3, 118):

Usque adeo solus ferrum mortemque timere
 Auri nescit amor,

and also (4, 577):

Sed regna timentur
 Ob ferrum, et saevis libertas uritur armis.

He has put into the mouth of Pothinus, advocating the murder of Pompey, words not unusual for the declaimers against tyranny (8, 487):

Sidera terra
 Ut distant et flamma mari, sic utile recto.
 Sceptrorum vis tota perit, si pendere iusta
 Incipit, evertitque arces respectus honesti.
 Libertas scelerum est, quae regna invisa tuetur,
 Sublatusque modus gladiis. Facere omnia saepe
 Non inpune licet, nisi cum facis. Exeat aula,
 Qui volt esse pius. Virtus et summa potestas
 Non coeunt; semper metuet, quem saeva pudebunt.

Nil facimus non sponte dei, declares Cato (9, 574), after the questions:

An noceat vis ulla bono? Fortunaque perdat
 Opposita virtute minas, laudandaque velle
 Sit satis, et numquam successu crescat honestum?

The animus of the actors is indicated by regnandi sola voluptas (8, 294). It was a time when the human race unoque sub ictu stat (6, 613), and when the best injunction was disce ferire | disce mori (5, 363), the best hope for the present, satis est iam posse mori (2, 109), and, for the future, in regnum nasci (7, 643). It is only the lowly that is carefree (8, 242):

Quanto igitur mundi dominis securius aevum
Verus pauper agit!

See also the section beginning felix qui potuit (4, 393). Wretched are they who carry on war (4, 382). He repeats established Roman belief in properante ruina | summa cadunt (5, 746). Quis scelerum modus? he asks (1, 334), and his answer is excessit medicina modum (2, 142).

In developing interesting scenes and themes he made use of a noticeable verbal skill. He has ignis edax (9, 742), as well as aetas edax (7, 397); pontus vorax (2, 663), as well as engulfing interest, usura vorax (1, 181). Equally graphic is vaesana quies (7, 764). Gloria . . . laetificat (3, 48) is a bold putting, and as rare as is limes . . . disternat (1, 216) or vestes discriminat auro (2, 357).

V. CONCLUSION.

We find (*Bell. Hisp.* 31, 7): *Hic, ut ait Ennius, pes pede premitur, armis teruntur arma* showing that the pitting of part against part was not unpracticed in early Latin poetry. May we not assume that to the readers of Lucan as well as of other poets such collocations retained somewhat of the flavor of antiquity. Some illustrations are pectore pectus | Urgueri (4, 624; cf. 4, 783); sonant . . . ensibus enses (7, 573).

While he was under obligations to the masters of poetry, he too had brilliancies of his own. Tennyson sings:

“’Tis well; ’tis something; we may stand
Where he in English earth is laid,
And from his ashes may be made
The violet of his native land.”

Lucan has practically the same thought (7, 865):

Vellere surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam,

with a like coloring in (*ib.* 851):

Quae seges infecta surget non decolor herba?

The best in the *Pharsalia* are the pictures of Caesar, Pompey and Cato, and in spite of the skill shown in developing scenes and themes, the poem does not have permeating interest. Transactions in Spain, Africa and Egypt are too loosely connected with the great strife to be of absorbing interest. The *Pharsalia* can be compared with the *Festus* of the young barrister, Philip James Bailey—a poem which lives on in the lines:

We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures on a dial.

We should count time by heart-throbs. He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

Lauded almost without stint at its appearance, in half a century the *Festus*, as a whole, was dead. Both poems are brilliant; both lacking something behind the brilliancy. The climax of the *Pharsalia* is the battle-scene, but this is merely a game of chance, as is stated (7, 445 ff.):

Sunt nobis nulla profecto
Numina; cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu,
Mentimur regnare Iovem.

A little further on he says that mortal affairs are cared for by no god. In the battle itself (*ib.* 487):

Rapit omnia casus,
Atque incerta facit, quos volt, fortuna nocentes.

At this point his reverence for Vergil overcomes a sense of propriety, and he has (*ib.* 512): *inde faces et saxa volant*, Vergil's words used to indicate mob conditions calmed by a man known for his merits. He declares that he will not tell what took place in the fight (*ib.* 556), yet he minutely paints the scene after the battle with the birds and beasts that feasted on the dead, and gives a summary in the words (*ib.* 809):

. . . *tabesne cadavera solvat*
An *rogus*, *haud refert*; *placido natura receptat*
Cuncta sinu finemque sui sibi corpora debent.

Hos, Caesar, populos si nunc non usserit ignis,
Uret cum terris, uret cum gurgite ponti;
Communis mundo superest rogos ossibus astra
Mixturus.

Cicero would be counted fortunate had he anticipated these lines; see *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 45, 108.

We may accept the judgment of Quintilian on Lucan, yet it was not the prose writers, but the poets who turned to him as they did to Vergil, and worked into their poetry many bars of his song, changed or unchanged, as if it were an assured fact that that which had won favor in the days of Nero would be welcomed in the days of Domitian. It was music, rather than subject matter which they had in view, although the interest in the latter was aided by many a verbal felicity, for Lucan touched nothing which he did not verbally adorn. Besides this element there was a noticeable fluency in his narrative, helped on by the use of the present participle. As an illustration we cite the description of Caesar (1, 149-157) in which are eight examples. However, with all its verbal felicity and fluency the *Pharsalia* does not attract as does the *Aeneid*, though every florilegium of Latin poetry should contain Lucan's pictures of Caesar, of Pompey, and of Cato.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

II.—THE DOCTRINE OF CAESURA, A PHILOLOGICAL GHOST.

In an article published in 1919, and entitled *The Theory of the Homeric Caesura according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine*,¹ Bassett showed that the doctrine of Caesura was not developed until after the best period of ancient scholarship, that the ancient statements about it are confused and inconsistent, and that we can hope for very little assistance from them. Two years later, I supplemented Bassett's discussion by showing the inconsistency of current theories of caesura with the data of phonetic science.² It would be idle, however, to hope that two brief articles could lay so old and familiar a ghost. It seems necessary to use some more powerful exorcism.

Aside from the ancient grammarians and metricians the chief source of the modern doctrine of caesura consists of certain facts which have been observed in the ancient verses themselves, and particularly in the hexameter. Our first task, then, is to outline the facts about word ends in the hexameter which demand explanation or which scholars have attempted to explain by various theories of caesura.

In Homer the commonest position for a word end is at the close of the fourth foot and after the third trochee. Of the first 800 lines of the *Iliad* (omitting the repetitions early in the second book), 63 per cent have bucolic diaeresis³ and 60.6 per cent have feminine caesura³ in the third foot. The masculine caesura³ of the second foot occurs in 58.4 per cent of these lines. Most verses without the feminine caesura in the third foot have the masculine caesura in that foot, so that about 98.7 per cent of all Homer's lines have one or both caesurae of the third foot.

In compiling these statistics and all others in this paper I

¹ AJP. XL, pp. 343-372.

² AJP. XLII, pp. 289-308.

³ I shall occasionally use the familiar terms "masculine caesura," "feminine caesura," and "diaeresis" for the three possible positions of word ends in reference to the feet. I do not intend these terms to imply any theory about the reasons why the word ends fall as they do.

have counted word ends in elision, after prepositions and other proclitics, and before postpositive words except enclitics; I have not included the ends of verbal prefixes standing immediately before their verbs or the ends of words to which enclitics are appended. The statement of the proportion of Homeric verses with no caesura in the third foot is based upon Lehrs's ⁴ list of such verses. He assumed a word end after a verbal prefix in *Il.* XXIII 159, because he felt it to be necessary to find a word end either in the third or in the fourth foot. Our practice requires that this verse be included among those without any caesura in the third foot. A more important difference between Lehrs's procedure and ours appears in the treatment of enclitics. Lehrs excluded from his list verses with an enclitic beginning after one or two syllables of the third foot, but we must include such lines as the following:

Il. I 106:

μάντι κακῶν, οὗ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας

I 179:

οἴκαδ' ἰὼν σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς ἐτάροισιν

III 205:

ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς

III 220:

φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτως.

Lehrs found 329 ⁵ Homeric verses with no word end in the third foot. The additions required by not assuming a word end before an enclitic would probably increase this number to about 350, or approximately 1.3 per cent of the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

It is customary to add that the omission of a caesura in the third foot is excused by the difficulty of getting a proper name into the verse. The fact is that proper names are no more difficult to handle than other words of equal length. As Lehrs ⁶

⁴ *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis* (1865), pp. 396-403.

⁵ W. Meyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1884, p. 999, erroneously reports that Lehrs found 219 such verses in the *Iliad* and 95 in the *Odyssey*. The latter figure is obtained by deducting certain repeated verses.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 416.

remarks, most of the lines in question might have been so constructed as to put a word end in the third foot, and, in any case, a number of the names which occupy the whole third foot are patronymics or the like and might have been omitted. After all, less than half of the lines in the list contain a proper name at the crucial point. It is foolish to suppose that a type of line that occurs some 350 times in Homer needs any excuse.

Nearly all of the Homeric verses with no word end in the third foot are subject to two remarkable limitations; they have no word end at the close of the third foot, and they have a word end immediately after the fourth ictus. In more familiar phrase, a verse with diaeresis after the third foot has caesura in that foot, and a verse without caesura in the third foot has masculine caesura in the fourth. The only exceptions are found in the neighborhood of verbal prefixes (*Il.* XXIII 159) or of enclitics (*Il.* I 179).

The last feature of Homeric verse that need be mentioned is that word ends are rare after the fourth trochee. G. Hermann⁷ found only 26 instances in all Homer. This small number, however, can be attained only by refusing to recognize word ends after prepositions or other proclitics or before postpositive words. If we make the count in our usual way, there are fourteen word ends after the fourth trochee in the first 800 lines of the *Iliad* (omitting the repetitions in the second book), or in 1.8 per cent of these lines. If we recognize word ends before enclitics—if we count as Lehrs did in collecting the lines without caesura in the third foot—4.5 per cent of the same lines have a word end after the fourth trochee. It appears, then, that a procedure which lessens the number of exceptions in the third foot increases the number here. Consequently some scholars have been tempted to count in one way in the third foot and in another in the fourth foot. We adopt the *via media* in both cases.

All of these salient features are retained in the later hexameter, in spite of some changes in detail. It is enough for our present purpose to record that word ends became more common after the third trochee and proportionately less common after the third and fourth ictus, while word ends after the fourth trochee became even more infrequent than in Homer.

⁷ *Orphica*, pp. 692-694.

In the Latin hexameter the feminine caesura of the third foot is very much less common than in Greek. It occurs in only 9.3 per cent of 300 lines of Catullus, 7.2 per cent of 300 lines of Lucretius, and in 11.1 per cent of 800 lines in Vergil. The masculine caesura of the third foot, on the other hand, is much more common than in Greek, so that in the first two books of the *Aeneid* 95.1 per cent. of the complete lines have a caesura in that foot. Even so, verses without caesura in the third foot are nearly four times as frequent as in Homer.

The Greek limitations upon such lines do not hold for Latin. The following have diaeresis after that foot without caesura within it: Ennius, *Ann.* 43, 230, 362, 522, *Scipio* 14 V.; Lucilius 394 M.; Lucretius III 258, VI 1067; Vergil *Aen.* II, 151, 555, XI 758, XII 144; Horace *Sat.* II 3. 134; Manilius I 194; Propertius II 17. 11; Silius V 497, VIII 327, XII 146, XV 13; Statius *Theb.* III 71; Juvenal X 358, XIV 108. There are nearly as many lines without caesura in the third or fourth foot; e. g., Ennius *Ann.* 43, 122, 230, 522; Lucilius 1074; Lucretius III 612, 630, 715, V 165, VI 197; Vergil *Aen.* XII 144; Horace *Sat.* II 3. 134, 181, *Ars* 87, 263,⁸ 377; Silius XIV 631; Statius *Theb.* III 71, 283. Scholars usually have no objection to admitting the existence of such lines in Ennius and Lucilius.⁹ There are various ways of getting rid of them if they occur in later poets. Sometimes a compound is cut into two words, either in the printed text or only in theory.¹⁰ By this means it is apparently possible to dispose of all lines in the classical and later poets which have no caesura in the third or fourth foot; but there remain a number of cases of diaeresis after the third foot for which the corresponding caesura cannot be provided by

⁸ It has been supposed (so most recently, Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 9) that this line:

Non quivis videt immodulata poemata iudex,

was purposely constructed to illustrate "unrhythmical" poems. But, since Horace elsewhere composed lines without caesura in the third or fourth foot, in his own person, so to speak, he can scarcely have intended this line as a caricature.

⁹ See L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*², p. 218.

¹⁰ L. Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 460 ff.

the division of a compound word. Examples are Lucretius III 258:

Nunc ea quo pacto inter sese mixta quibusque

and Vergil *Aen.* XI 758:

Portat ovans. Ducis exemplum eventumque secuti.

To dispose of such cases Lachmann¹¹ held that in case of elision the elided syllable might be retained for the purpose of procuring a satisfactory caesura; his reading of Lucretius VI 1067 was:

Quae memorare queam inter singillariter apta,

and in this line he found a penthemimeral caesura! We need scarcely pause to notice such legerdemain; proof that elision involved complete loss of the syllable involved was adduced by Sturtevant and Kent, *TAPA*. XLVI, pp. 129-155.

In the use of word ends after the fourth trochee and at the close of the fourth foot Latin usage does not differ very markedly from Greek, although the tendency in Vergil and his successors is for the caesura after the fourth trochee to be a little more common and for the bucolic diaeresis to occur a little less frequently than in the Greek poets.

The striking feature in the arrangement of word ends in the Latin hexameter is that masculine caesura is rare in the fifth and sixth feet, fairly common in the first foot, and very common in the second, third, and fourth.¹² Many Latin hexameters have masculine caesura in all three of the middle group of feet, and a very large majority have masculine caesura in two of them. There are very few lines, like Vergil *Ecl.* V 52, with no masculine caesura in second, third, or fourth foot.

This is far from being a complete account of the position of word ends in the hexameter, or even of the facts which have been employed by students of caesura; but it will serve as a background for the present discussion.

The theories which have been built upon the double basis of ancient doctrine and the outstanding facts about the arrangement of word ends in verse are numerous and diverse. An account of them all would be not only tedious but bewildering

¹¹ In *Lucretii De Rerum Naturae Libros Commentarius*, pp. 413 f.

¹² Witte, *Rh. M.* LXIX, pp. 207, 214, 217, observed these features in Ennius. They are characteristic of all Latin hexameters.

rather than instructive. Bassett closes his résumé of the discussion in modern times with these words (p. 346): "Thus a century of research and criticism has left us still uncertain what value we are to give to caesura in the oral rendering of Homeric verse, for it has failed to make clear the nature of the pause which caesura is said to be." This is a moderate characterization. Not only do scholars disagree in their conception of caesura, but, as a rule, they feel no obligation to justify their disagreement. Nearly all subscribe to the dogma that caesura is of the utmost importance; but each writer is at liberty to construct his own definition and to operate with one caesura for each verse or with half a dozen.

Even more distressing is the vagueness or even inconsistency of many discussions of our topic. Bassett (*loc. cit.*) illustrates what he politely terms "the eclectic position" by an analysis of the treatment of caesura in White's *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. Even more striking eclecticism is displayed in Witte's important articles.¹³ He employs at least four fundamentally different conceptions of caesura, for which he ordinarily uses different terms, but all of which may be called "Cäsur". The suture where the two members of an original couplet are thought to have been fused together he calls by the traditional name "bukolische Diärese". A word end carefully placed at a certain point or at one of several points in the verse he calls "Einschnitt". For a word end placed at a certain point in the foot, namely after the first syllable of the dactyl or spondee, he coins the name "Arsisdiärese". A sense pause breaking the verse at certain preferred points is called "Rezitationspause", "Hauptrezitationspause", or "Hauptpause".

Virtually the same fundamental conceptions or some of them appear in various combinations in the writings of all scholars who treat of caesura, although few have come as near as Witte to recognizing their essential difference. It will be convenient to confine our discussion to the elements and to neglect the compounds in which they usually occur.

Probably the commonest ingredient in the current theories of caesura is the doctrine that the dactylic hexameter must, and

¹³ *Glotta* III, pp. 129-148, IV, pp. 1-21, Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie* VIII, 2241-2247, *Rh. M.* LXIX, pp. 205-232.

certain other verses may, consist of two or more rhythmic cola and that these cola must end with the end of a word, just as a verse must ordinarily do.¹⁴ The theory is sometimes based upon Aristoxenus' limitation of the length of a compound foot (*πὺς μέγιστος*) in the following passage (fragmentum ap. Psell. 12, p. 85 Westphal):

αὐξέσθαι δὲ φαίνεται τὸ μὲν ἰαμβικὸν γένος μέχρι τοῦ ὀκτωκαιδεκάσημου μεγέθους ὥστε γίνεσθαι τὸν μέγιστον πόδα ἑξαπλάσιον τοῦ ἐλάχιστου, τὸ δὲ δακτυλικὸν μέχρι τοῦ ἑκκαιδεκάσημου, τὸ δὲ παιωνικὸν μέχρι τοῦ πεντεκαιεικοσασήμου.

The part of this passage that is thought to require a rhythmic caesura is the limitation of a dactylic *πὺς μέγιστος* to sixteen primary times or four dactyls; for this seems to say that a hexameter contains more than one *πὺς μέγιστος*. But one can find here evidence for a caesura only by making several unwarranted assumptions. (1) There is no hint either in this passage or elsewhere that the *πὺς μέγιστος* must close with a word end any more than the *πὺς ἐλάχιστος*, unless, to be sure, the *πὺς μέγιστος* be identified with the verse. (2) Aristoxenus puts his statement as the result of observation; he says that these "seem" to be the upper limits of the several kinds of feet. We have no right to elevate a mere statement of fact into a fundamental principle of versification. (3) Probably the observations here recorded were made upon melic verse, since that is the sort of verse that Aristoxenus chiefly treated. The passage need have no validity for heroic verse—the type of hexameter in which scholars are prone to find rhythmic caesura.

Aristoxenus does not suggest a reason for limiting the length of the *πὺς μέγιστος*, but one is supplied by modern scholars. Says White:¹⁵ "A colon is a rhythmical unit capable of continuous control by the voice, and therefore of limited extent." He does not explain why the voice is not "capable of continuous control" over as great an extent of dactylic rhythm as of iambic or paeonic. And yet, if such control can cover as much as twenty-five primary times, we have here no reason for a caesura

¹⁴ For an incomplete list of scholars who hold this view, see Bassett, pp. 345 ff.

¹⁵ *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, p. 7.

in the dactylic hexameter. We may note in passing that any scholar who assumes a caesura in the hexameter upon the strength of Aristoxenus's dictum is logically bound to reject the dogma of a rhythmic caesura in the iambic trimeter. It is for this reason that Klotz ¹⁶ refuses to find any rhythmic significance in the caesura of the trimeter.

Other scholars ¹⁷ say more explicitly that the hexameter was too long a verse to be recited conveniently without a pause. Now this is simply not true; every man frequently pronounces breath groups as long as the hexameter line.¹⁸ But even if the statement were true, it would not be a reason for assuming any pauses other than those required by the sense, but for finding enough sense pauses to serve. The need for limiting the breath groups to manageable proportions holds not merely for verse, but for all speech. This explanation has taken us again into the realm of "eclecticism"; it is inconsistent to say that the function of caesura is to separate rhythmic cola and also that caesura is due to the need for breath groups shorter than the hexameter verse.

But, even if there be no demonstrable need of dividing the hexameter into two cola, this may conceivably have been done. The dactylic pentameter is to all intents and purposes composed of two members, and it might properly be printed as a couplet if that were convenient. If the hexameter always had a word end at some fixed point, it would be in nearly the same case. Lehrs ¹⁹ undertook, as a matter of fact, to confine the Homeric caesura always to the third foot, but not even he could keep it at a single point in that foot.

¹⁶ *Grundzüge der altrömischen Metrik*, p. 165.

¹⁷ So Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 100.

¹⁸ How thoroughly a scholar can cut himself off from reality when he goes chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of caesura, is shown by W. Meyer's explanation (*Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1884, p. 997) of the "secondary caesura" in the fourth foot as due to the difficulty of pronouncing three and a half feet in one breath.

¹⁹ *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*², p. 409, *Opuscula*, pp. 433, 459, 463 f. He was followed by J. H. H. Schmidt, *Die Antike Compositionslehre*, p. 112, and by W. Meyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1884, p. 999.

If we treat the hexameter in the same way as the pentameter we are forced to conceive of it as a couplet whose total length is constant, but whose component verses vary in length. If we always prefer to divide after the third trochee, and make our second and third choice respectively after the third ictus and after the fourth ictus, about 60.6 per cent of Homer's hexameters will consist of 11 morae + 13 morae, about 38.1 per cent of 10 morae + 14, and about 1.3 per cent of 14 morae + 10. In Latin these three types of hexameter would all have to be recognized, although in very different proportions. There would also be occasional couplets with 8 or 15 or 16 morae in the first member. A series of verses unequal in length is natural enough; but it would be remarkable to have such unequal verses constantly combined into couplets of precisely equal length. To state the same difficulty from another point of view, the dactylic hexameter is a verse of extraordinarily regular metrical structure, and this regularity is inconsistent with the assumption that the members of the hexameter are irregular in length and structure.

Another difficulty with the rhythmic theory of caesura is that it involves a forced and unnatural way of reading verse. We may take it for granted that an obligatory feature of versification must be in some way audible. It has usually been assumed that the slight pause which has been thought to occur at the end of every word, was enough to separate the two rhythmic cola. As we shall see below (p. 347), there were no pauses at word ends within a breath group; but, even if, for the sake of the argument, we concede such pauses, the placing of one of them in the third or fourth foot could not have led the hearer to infer a division of the verse there. In *Il.* I 13:

'Ατρείδης. ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θεὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,

there are seven word ends, and the one after ἦλθε could not have been more noticeable than the others unless it was audibly distinguished from them in some way; if there was no departure from the natural pronunciation of these words, the pause after 'Ατρείδης must have been the only one to be distinguished from the rest.

Lehrs (*loc. cit.*) thought that caesura was marked by higher

pitch on the first syllable of the third foot succeeded by lowered pitch on the following short syllable in case of feminine caesura or on the latter part of the long syllable itself in case of masculine caesura. This theory is probably not held by any one today; but if it needs refutation, this is provided by the use of the Greek accents in the third foot of the hexameter. The modulation which Lehrs prescribes would amount to acute accent on the second syllable before the feminine caesura and circumflex on the syllable before the masculine caesura; the poets would certainly have provided such accents as far as possible, but no tendency in that direction can be observed.

Almost as unnatural as this would be the reading of every hexameter with an arbitrary pause in the third or fourth foot, regardless of the requirements of the sense. And yet there seems to be no other way in which the rhythmical cola could be distinguished in delivery. Sound method requires us to reject such a theory unless strong evidence can be adduced in its favor.

The rhythmic theory was, of course, suggested by the fact that over 98 per cent of the Greek hexameters have a word end in the third foot. This evidence is counterbalanced by the different state of affairs in Latin. The only other evidence that has been adduced is the occasional use of a short syllable for a long before the so-called main caesura, and the occasional occurrence of hiatus at the same point. Meister²⁰ has recently discussed the use of short final syllables for long in Homer. Since such lengthening occurs throughout the verse and in the arsis as well as in the thesis, he concludes that the practice must have had its origin, not in metrical considerations, but in the development of the epic dialect. In verses and verse tags that were handed down from poet to poet, the loss of one of a group of consonants (most frequently σ or ρ) deprived certain syllables of their length by position. On the analogy of such traditional phrases, new ones were sometimes composed with a similar irregularity. Hiatus²¹ also occurs in various parts of the verse, and it is almost as frequent at the end of the first foot as after the third trochee. The similar licences in Latin verse are no doubt imitative of the Greek hexameter; here too the occurrences

²⁰ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 40-42.

²¹ See Meister, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

are so widely distributed through the line that they cannot be said to support the theory of rhythmical caesura.²²

That theory, then, involves serious difficulties and rests upon no evidence of importance. Meillet²³ is right in insisting that caesura does not mark the end of a rhythmical member.

The belief that the hexameter consists of two cola has suggested to various scholars that it is historically a fusion of two short verses. This theory has one advantage over the more strictly rhythmical theory; it explains the prevailing incidence of word ends at the end of the first member of the original couplet as due to tradition, and at the same time it provides a ready explanation of verses without a word end there—they would represent a newer type of line that developed after the fusion of the originally distinct members.

There have been two important suggestions of this sort. Theodor Bergk²⁴ derived the hexameter from an enoplios, $\bar{\cup} - \cup \cup - \sim -$, and a paroemiac, $\bar{\cup} - \sim - \sim - \bar{\cup}$, the point of fusion being after the third ictus. Usener²⁵ pointed out that the prevailing feminine caesura in Homer was against the assumption of the enoplios as the first element. He thought that the heroic verse consisted of two paroemiacs. Usener undertook to trace the paroemiac among several Indo-European peoples, and he believed that he had discovered numerous imperfectly fused hexameters in Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, and also a few in Greek inscriptions of classical times. It is now known, however, that his Germanic and Slavic material is of recent origin, while the interpretation of the Iranian and Indian verse which he followed, is no longer accepted by specialists in those languages. Few scholars would today be inclined to see in imperfect epigraphical hexameters of classical times anything but unsuccessful attempts of amateur versifiers to write ordinary heroic lines. As we have just seen, the irregularities of the Homeric hexameter scarcely point to a division of the verse in the third foot.

²² The material in Vergil is conveniently collected in Johnston, *The Metrical Licences of Vergil*, pp. 19-24, 38-41.

²³ *Les Origines Indo-Européennes des Mètres Grecs*, p. 10.

²⁴ *Ueber das älteste Versmass der Griechen; Programm der Universität Freiburg* = *Kleine Philologische Schriften* 2, pp. 392 ff.

²⁵ *Altgriechischer Versbau*.

There is, then, really nothing in favor of Bergk's and Usener's theory, except the presence of a word end in the third foot of nearly all Homeric lines. Even this evidence is weakened by the fact that lapse of time did not tend further to obscure the assumed suture in the verse; the Alexandrian hexameter is even closer than Homer's to Usener's original couplet.

Others have seen in the bucolic diaeresis the point of fusion between a dactylic tetrameter and an adonic, a suggestion which has been ingeniously supported by Witte in one of the articles referred to above.²⁶ His argument consists of a series of hypotheses by which he traces the development, from the assumed couplet, of several common types of Homeric line and explains a number of Homeric forms and words as having been created by the poets to assist in constructing the couplet and the successor types. Most of what he says is plausible, but there is no real evidence behind the theory except that about 63 per cent of Homer's verses have a word end at the end of the fourth foot and that this is the most common position for a sense pause within the line. Meister²⁷ is right in withholding assent to Witte's theory of the origin of the hexameter.

A third conception of caesura asserts that if word ends coincide with the ends of metrical units the verse tends to fall apart.²⁸ Hence arises a sharp distinction between a word end within a foot, called caesura, and a word end at the close of a foot, called diaeresis. I confess that it is difficult for me to take the theory seriously. It seems to imply that the reciter's attention is fixed upon grammar and meter rather than upon meaning and music, that he is thinking of words rather than of sentences and that he is picking out feet rather than feeling the swing of the verse. Such an attitude is to be found, no doubt, among schoolmasters and schoolboys; we call the result "scansion".

Now, for many centuries scansion has been taught in connection with the first book of the *Iliad*, and this, I suspect, is the reason why two ancient schoolmasters and one modern²⁹

²⁶ *Glotta*, IV, pp. 1-21.

²⁷ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 57, 231, 233.

²⁸ Roszbach-Westphal, *Metrik*³, pp. 27, 32; L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*³, p. 198.

²⁹ See Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*³, p. 184, and references.

have found fault with the only verse in that book in which there is a word end at the close of each foot, namely line 214:

ὑβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε· σὺ δ' ἰσχεο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.

Homer was probably not aware that the line was inferior to its neighbors; for he frequently composed similar verses. I have found 13 of them in four books of the *Iliad* and four of the *Odyssey*; ⁸⁰ if this proportion holds there must be about 78 in all. Furthermore there are many verses in which all the feet but one end with the end of a word. There are eight such verses in the first book of the *Iliad* and eight in the first book of the *Odyssey*.

Probably the only reason why Homer did not compose more verses of these two types is that only 11.2 per cent of his words are of the right length and quantitative character to occupy just one foot. Even with the help of monosyllables, pyrrhics, and trochees, verses with prevailing coincidence of word ends and foot ends would scarcely tend to occur more frequently than we actually find them.

No reader, as far as I know, has found fault with any Homeric verse with a word end at the close of every foot, except *Il.* I 214, and most critics find even that satisfactory. With *Il.* I 214 Christ (*loc. cit.*) couples Ennius *Scip.* 14 V.:

Sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret.

This is worse than the Homeric line, Christ finds, since it not only has a word end at the close of each foot, but it has no word end within the third foot. We hasten to admit that it is a bad line; but the trouble is not with the position of the word ends, as may be shown by altering it just enough to put all the word ends within the feet, thus:

Nunc sparsis hastis longis campus splendescit.

The line has not been improved; most readers will feel that it is somewhat worse than before. The chief blemish is the heaping up of harsh consonant clusters containing the sound *s* in various surroundings, and this fault we have made worse by our revision.

The theory under discussion must be tested not by an ex-

⁸⁰ *Il.* I 214, II 468, XIX 93, 255, XX 127, 193, *Od.* IV 153, 253, 508, 726 = 816, 821, 826. Another example is *Il.* IV 455.

amination of particular passages, but by statistics on the position of word ends in the verse. Table I gives the number of occurrences per one hundred lines of word ends coinciding with the ends of each of the first five feet. The figures are based upon 800 lines each of the *Iliad* and of Vergil's *Aeneid*, 500 lines of Theocritus, and 300 lines each of Apollonius, Catullus, and Lucretius.

TABLE I

Feet	I	II	III	IV	V
<i>Iliad</i>	44.1	22.1	21.5	63.0	24.8
Apollonius	44.3	19.0	15.7	64.3	26.3
Theocritus	54.6	16.4	38.6	77.8	37.6
Catullus	49.7	7.0	11.3	73.0	58.3
Lucretius	43.0	18.7	17.0	57.0	44.3
Vergil	42.8	16.4	15.0	51.1	60.6

Considerably more than half of the lines studied have a word end at the close of the fourth foot. Vergil and Catullus have a word end at the close of the fifth foot more than half of the time, and so has Theocritus at the close of the first foot. The feet which show fewest diaereses are the second and third, where we have an average of 16.6 per cent and 19.9 per cent respectively. If the poets had tried to avoid diaereses they could have done better than that.

In spite of the facts schoolmasters sometimes propose precise rules for the avoidance of word ends at the ends of the feet. Thus Monro ³¹ says flatly: "The third foot must not end with a word". Table I shows that this amounts to grading Homer at 78 per cent on the first 800 lines of the *Iliad*!

Winbolt ³² says that the Romans objected to word ends coinciding with the ends of the feet, but that "in course of time it was felt to be satisfactory if there was not in the line a majority of feet, the ends of which corresponded with the ends of words, the last foot of course not counting. Thus though a line in which there were two cases of the coincidence of the ends of words and feet might be held to be permissible, taste was against the threefold repetition of this arrangement." Now of the first 500 lines of the *Aeneid* 139 or 27.8 per cent have three or more

³¹ *Iliad*, Books I-XII⁶, p. lxxiv. Hardie, *Res Metrica*, p. 11, says that such lines "are not very common."

³² *Latin Hexameter Verse*, p. 71.

diaereses, and 16 or 3.2 per cent have four diaereses. To make matters worse, Vergil's supposed carelessness is greatest toward the close of the line, which was the most important part of the Latin hexameter. Of the first 100 lines of the *Aeneid* 47 have a word end at the close of both the fourth and the fifth foot. We cannot avoid the conclusion that Vergil paid no attention to this feature of scansion.

A cursory glance shows that the facts are equally unfavorable to the supposition that the iambic poets avoided word ends coinciding with the ends of the feet. Of the first 100 trimeters of *Iphigenia in Tauris* 54 have a word end at the close of the first foot, 21 at the close of the second, 38 at the close of the third, 51 at the close of the fourth, and 61 at the close of the fifth. Of the first 100 textually sound senarii in Plautus's *Menaechmi* (exclusive of the prologue) 54 have diaeresis after the first foot, 18 after the second, 39 after the third, 45 after the fourth, and 39 after the fifth.

We may safely conclude that the hexameter and the trimeter were never in danger of falling to pieces anywhere outside the classroom. In fact, no connected discourse can fall apart except at a sense pause, unless speaker or hearer is subjected to some physical or psychological disturbance.

More plausible is the theory that the poets tried to secure variety in the relation of word ends and feet.³³ The remarkable regularity of the hexameter was in danger of growing monotonous, and here, apparently, was one way in which variety might be secured. But this suggestion, like the preceding, seems inconsistent with the fact that Homer composed some seventy lines with a word end at the close of every foot. The later poets, both Greek and Latin, seem to have felt no difficulty in such lines; a brief search has brought to light nineteen of them,³⁴ and there must be several hundred others. Lines in which all feet except one close with a word end are common at all periods. I find 64 of them in Theocritus I-V and 12 in the first book of the *Aeneid*.

³³ Hermann, *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*, p. 37; Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, pp. 185 f.; Meister, *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 55 f.

³⁴ Apollonius I 659; Callimachus *Apollo* 109, *Artemis* 236, *Delos* 214, 287; Theocritus II 21, IV 43; Ennius *Ann.* 522, *Scip.* 14 V.; Lucretius I 662, 809, 853, 1058; Vergil *Ecl.* VIII 83, *Georg.* III 213, Horace *Sat.* I 2. 123, 9. 5, 16, 51.

The principle of variety is violated quite as much by the occasional verses with a word end after each ictus syllable. I find four of these in two books of Lucretius (II 1156, III 96, 267, 885). Lines with five masculine caesurae are not very rare. Examples are: *Od.* II 397, IV 175, Theocritus XIV 21, Vergil *Ecl.* VI 9, *Georg.* II 103. There are nine such lines in the second book of Lucretius.

The strongest evidence that the poets did not try to secure variety in the position of word ends is to be found in passages of more than one line in which word ends repeatedly fall at the same point in the foot. Thus *Il.* I 214 (quoted above p. 341) with six word ends coinciding with the ends of feet is preceded by a line with four such coincidences. Equally striking is the opening of the *Odyssey* where lines 1, 3, and 4 have only one foot each that ends within a word. Although the second line has no coincidence of word end and foot end except at its close, sixteen out of the first twenty-four feet end with a word end. Theocritus II 21, in which all feet end with a word end, is followed by a line with the same coincidence in five feet, and that in turn by a line with four coincidences. Three successive lines, each with five feet ending at a word end, occur in Theocritus I 65 ff., and II 52 ff., and two such lines come together in Theocritus I 19 f., 115 f., 123 f., II 36 f., 42 f., IV 55 f., and V 24 f. In Vergil *Aen.* I 299-302 there are seventeen successive feet only two of which do not close with a word end.

The masculine and feminine caesurae are not commonly repeated so many times within a short space, but a good many such instances as the following could be found. In *Il.* I. 130 f. and again in *Il.* II 413 f. we have seven masculine caesurae in ten successive feet, and in *Il.* II 369 f. there are eleven masculine caesurae in fifteen feet. In *Il.* I 95 f. a word ends between two short syllables six times, and the first of the two lines ends with a trochee, so that we have virtually seven feminine caesurae in eight successive feet. Lucretius has twelve masculine caesurae in sixteen feet (II 1155 ff.) and sixteen in twenty-one feet (III 94-97), and he also has ten successive feet all with masculine caesura (III 885 f.). Vergil has seven masculine caesurae in nine successive feet (*Georg.* IV 251 f.).

Someone will reply that variety in this matter is nevertheless the rule with all the hexameter poets. Since there are three possible places for a word end in each dactyl and two in each spondee, and since more than forty different quantitative types of words are employed in hexameter verse,³⁵ variety in the position of the word ends would necessarily result if the poets paid no attention to the matter.

Under these circumstances one could make it probable that the poets tried to secure variety in the arrangement of word ends only by showing that they avoided the occasional repetition which chance would bring (and this, we have just seen, they did not do), or by demonstrating some sort of development of technique.

A development, or at least a difference, in technique has in fact been alleged. Havet³⁶ finds that the Roman poets had a more exacting taste than the Greeks in that they objected to having the same type of caesura in the third foot as in the sixth. Says Havet: "Le bon Homère finissait naïvement le premier hémistiche comme le second. . . Quand il ressuscita sous le nom de Q. Ennius, son oreille était devenue plus délicate, et il s'arrangea pour faire habilement alterner la cadence masculine et la cadence féminine." This, of course, is a jest; one learns from the context that in Havet's opinion the Roman poets had to pay closer attention to the word ends because every Latin word had, so he thought, a stress accent on the first syllable, which made the position of the word ends more noticeable. But most scholars believe that the early Latin initial stress had been lost before Ennius' time; and they, if they hold to the doctrine of intentional variety in arranging the word ends, must in sober earnest rate Ennius' taste higher than Homer's. Isn't this enough to condemn the theory?

Wilhelm Meyer³⁷ followed Havet in general, but differed from

³⁵ The common ones are the two types of monosyllable, six types of trisyllable (~~~ and -~- are impossible in the hexameter), and nine types of quadrisyllable (~~~~, ~~~~, ~~-~, ~~~~, ~--~, --~-, and -~- cannot occur). In five hundred lines of the *Iliad* I find fourteen of the longer types illustrated. Undoubtedly more than five additional types occur.

³⁶ *MSL*. VI, p. 14.

³⁷ *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1889 II, pp. 235-245.

him in thinking that both in Greek and in Latin the accent prescribed by the ancients upon one of the last three syllables of the word was a stress accent. Thus, while the relatively greater freedom of the Greek accent permitted great variety at the caesura and at the end of the verse, in Latin the end of the hexameter normally had just one possible accentuation, and the same accentuation was inevitable at a feminine caesura, as in:

Infandum, *regína*, iubes renovare *dolórem*.

There was no way, Meyer thought, of avoiding the monotonous accentuation at the close, but the use of the masculine caesura avoided its appearance twice in the same line. As a matter of fact, however, there were at least three possible ways of avoiding an accent under the sixth ictus. The most obvious of these is the use of a final monosyllable (*magnis⁶ dis, ridiculus⁶ mus*). Hypermetrical verses, such as:

Iactemur, doceas; ignari hominumque locorumque,

would serve the same purpose. Finally, words like *pharetra* and *volucres*, which were pretty certainly accented on the antepenult, may be used at the close of the hexameter. These three devices are all used sparingly. Final monosyllables were rare and hypermetric lines disfavored, and, if *volucres* and the like were favored at the verse close that is because bacchiac words were peculiarly convenient in that position, and the Latin language happened to possess relatively few of them.

For our present purpose, however, it is enough to note that Meyer's explanation of the prevalence of the masculine caesura in the third foot of the Latin hexameter has nothing to do with the word ends as such, but is based upon certain peculiarities of the Latin accent. He was here on the right track, although it was a favorite dogma of his that the Romans paid no attention to accent in composing verse.

A further difficulty with the two conceptions of caesura just discussed and with any theory which ascribes importance to the word ends as such is that they require that the word ends shall somehow be felt when verse is recited. Many scholars²⁸ assume

²⁸ E. g., Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*², p. 169; L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*², p. 198; Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 338; Lindsay, *The Captivi of Plautus*, p. 69; Hardie, *Res Metrica*, p. 27. Cf. Meillet, *Les Origines Indo-Européennes des Mètres Grecs*, p. 51.

that this is effected by a slight pause after each word. Trained observers of speech sounds are agreed, however, that there are no such pauses in the languages spoken today.³⁹ It is not likely that Greek and Latin differed in this respect from the modern languages, and, in the article referred to at the outset,⁴⁰ I brought evidence that they were in fact free from pauses within the phrase.

It has been suggested to me that the position of word ends is nevertheless known and felt and that this is reason enough for taking careful account of word ends in verse. It has long been the belief of most students of linguistic science⁴¹ that the naïve speaker has little or no consciousness of the word ends and that words are mere abstractions based upon more or less scholarly analysis of the real units of speech—namely sentences. This opinion will have to be modified in view of the considerations advanced by Sapir,⁴² who records “that the naïve Indian, quite unaccustomed to the concept of the written word, has nevertheless no serious difficulty in dictating a text to a linguistic student word by word; he tends, of course, to run his words together as in actual speech, but if he is called to a halt and is made to understand what is desired, he can readily isolate the words as such, repeating them as units. He regularly refuses, on the other hand, to isolate the radical or grammatical element on the ground that it ‘makes no sense’.” Sapir says furthermore that he has twice taught intelligent young Indians to write their own languages, and that they have spontaneously adopted the same system of word division that would have been chosen by any scholar.

Sapir has proved, I take it, that the naïve speaker has a fairly clear idea of what constitutes a word and that he can analyze his sentences correctly; but still we must agree with Bloomfield

³⁹ See Sweet, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1875-76, pp. 471 ff. = *Collected Papers*, pp. 3 ff.; Sievers, *Grundzüge der Phonetik*⁵, 231 f.; Passy, *Les Sons du Français*, pp. 43-47 = *The Sounds of the French Language*, pp. 25-28; Jespersen, *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*², p. 206.

⁴⁰ AJP. XLII, pp. 289-308.

⁴¹ See Sweet, *loc. cit.*; Brugmann, *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, pp. 281, 623 f., *Grundriss* II 1, pp. 1 f.; and especially L. Bloomfield, TAPA XLV, pp. 55-75.

⁴² *Language*, pp. 34 f.

when he says (*op. cit.* p. 66): "We find it obvious and easily proved that in most of our speaking we are conscious of the whole sentence only, not of the words into which it may be divided. The experiment is easily made: one asks a speaker to tell how many words he has used in the casual sentence just spoken. The answer, if it comes at all, will be surprisingly long in preparing." It is safe to say that, whatever may be true of reading a printed text, few persons are conscious of the word ends in speaking or hearing either prose or verse. At any rate such consciousness is not strong enough to be a controlling factor in the composition of verse.

Nevertheless many classical scholars are conscious of the position of word ends as they read Greek and Latin verse. This comes in part from much reading, but chiefly, I am convinced, from conscientious attention paid to the traditional rules for caesura. I draw the inference from my own experience. I have for many years read Greek and Latin verse aloud without a thought of caesura; but since I have been collecting statistics on word ends in verse in the hope of proving the folly of such studies, I have found my feeling for word ends improving. I fear I shall finally become as abnormal as any of my colleagues!

The fifth and last common conception of caesura is the sense pause. As far as I know, sense pause and caesura are never completely identified; scholars who correlate the two nevertheless find some sense pauses which are not caesurae and some caesurae where the break in the sense is of the slightest. In its pure form, this element of the doctrine of caesura would scarcely be recognized as a metrical, but rather as a rhetorical topic. Its most satisfactory ancient treatment was by a rhetorician, Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁴³ An exhaustive discussion of it, uncontaminated by the doctrine of caesura, would be of great value for our appreciation of ancient poetry, and, indirectly, for our understanding of ancient verse. An excellent beginning has been made, as far as Homeric verse is concerned, by Meister,⁴⁴ although his attention is not directed definitely to this subject. Winbolt⁴⁵ has some excellent observations on sense pauses in the Latin hexameter.

⁴³ *De Comp. Verb.* XXVI.

⁴⁴ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, passim, especially, pp. 28-34.

⁴⁵ *Latin Hexameter Verse*, pp. 1-69.

At present we need merely indicate certain ways in which the doctrine of sense pauses in the hexameter will differ from all theories of caesura. The first and most important difference is that many lines have no sense pause. In this matter there is certain to be much difference of opinion, but unless we feel a need for separating a verb from its subject or from its object, the following lines from the opening of the *Iliad* contain no pause.

- 3: πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν.
 8: τίς τ' ἄρ' σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
 11: οὐνεκα τὸν Χρῦσιν ἠτίμασεν ἄρητῆρα
 Ἄτρεΐδης.
 22: ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν Ἀχαιοί.

By the same criterion it can be shown that a good many lines have no sense pause at their close. A case in point is *Il.* I 11, quoted above. Frequently the sense pauses divide two successive lines into a number of shorter units, one of which lies partly at the close of one line and partly at the opening of the next, as in *Il.* I 74 f.:

ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, κέλεαί με, Διὶ φίλε, μυθήσασθαι
 μῆνιν Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐκατηβέλεταο ἄνακτος.

I do not now mean to assume that the lack of a sense pause at the close of a line necessarily obscured the stichometry for the hearer, although I am inclined to think that such was the case. The present point is merely that a study of sense pauses would have frequently to take account of more than a single line, and this would distinguish such a study from every form of the doctrine of caesura.

In the third place, the technique of Greek poets in regard to sense pauses was more precisely regulated than that of the Romans. In the Greek hexameter sense pauses were almost entirely excluded from the position after the fourth trochee, and they were extremely rare in the last two feet and at the close of the second and third feet. In the Latin hexameter sense pauses occur even after the fourth trochee. They are rare at several of the places where they are avoided in Greek, but they are fairly common at the end of the second foot and in the middle and at the end of the fifth foot. There is, furthermore, much difference

between the usage of the several Roman poets. This state of affairs contrasts with the familiar statement that the caesura of the Latin hexameter is more strictly regulated than that of the Greek hexameter.

Bassett showed that the ancient theories of caesura can safely be neglected by students of versification. I hope to have shown that the modern doctrine of caesura is no more secure. The fact remains that word ends and sense pauses are very unevenly distributed in ancient verses, and there are noteworthy differences according to period, genre, and language as well as individual differences. Both topics call for further study and explanation; but such work must not be based upon the theory of rhythmic cola, or upon ill-founded theories of the origin of Greek verse forms, or upon the notion that word ends are either audible or psychologically prominent. Furthermore the position of word ends and the position of sense pauses must be treated as two separate topics, which are interdependent only because a sense pause requires a word end.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

III.—NOTES ON ARISTOTLE'S 'RHETORIC.'

The opening chapter of the *Rhetoric* answers the purpose of a modern preface. It proclaims at the outset the author's primary object in his book. Aristotle's object is to show how truth and justice may be aided by the effective use of public speech. In the body of the work fallacious arguments are, without comment, supplied to the reader as freely as legitimate ones. Owing to the seeming indifference with which he presents the one sort or the other, Aristotle has been accused of cynicism by modern critics who have, for the moment, forgotten such prefatory warnings as: "We must be able to employ persuasion, just as strict reasoning can be employed, on opposite sides of a question, not in order that we may in practice employ it in both ways (for we must not make people believe what is wrong), but in order that we may see clearly what the facts are, and that, if another man argues unfairly, we on our part may be able to confute him (1355^a 29-33)." Such is the ideal which redeems even the treacherous or arid ground along which the *Rhetoric* sometimes passes.

In a treatise on speech-making, Aristotle is naturally careful to begin well and to end well. The first words of his epilogue are business-like (ὁ δ' ἐπίλογος σύγκειται ἐκ τεττάρων), and the last are a true peroration (the epilogue of an epilogue),—the crisp, staccato, conclusion of which the final word of all is a demand for that act of *judgment* or *decision* on which so much stress has been laid in the author's treatment of parliamentary and forensic oratory: εἴρηκα, ἀκηκόατε, ἔχετε, κρίνατε. The words with which the *Rhetoric* starts are: ἡ ῥητορική ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῇ διαλεκτικῇ. I hope to offer elsewhere some reasons for thinking that Aristotle in this opening sentence of his προοίμιον means to join issue—without losing a single moment—with Plato's contemptuous dismissal of rhetoric in the *Gorgias*. Rhetoric is to be regarded as the counterpart not of a choice *cuisine* (*Gorgias* 465 D), but of dialectic.

Nor does Aristotle delay to mention, critically again, his technical predecessors—the writers of "arts" of rhetoric (οἱ τὰς τέχνας τῶν λόγων συντιθέντες, 1354^a 12: cp. τεχνολογοῦσιν, 1354^b

17). The references, general or particular, to these writers in the *Rhetoric* should be gathered together; they are more numerous and instructive than is sometimes thought, though slight indeed when compared with what the lost *συναγωγή τεχνῶν* must have been. The term by which the dedicatory letters of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1421^a 39) designates the class in question is οἱ τεχνογράφοι: the nearest approach to this noun in the *Rhetoric* is τοὺς νῦν τεχνολογοῦντας (1356^a 17).

In 1354^a 13, αἱ πίστεις (bearing the same technical sense as in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* and in Isocrates) reminds us that the *Rhetoric* is full of "terms of art"—a phrase which is doubly significant when applied to what was once thought of as the art of arts—and that a Glossary (with equivalents in English, Latin, and the modern continental languages) should be regarded as an essential part of any modern edition of the *Rhetoric*. πίστεις (which in the *Rhetoric* has both a broader and a narrower meaning) is at once a cardinal and a troublesome term. No satisfactory English single-word equivalent has yet been offered for it. Most translators are content with "proofs"; but this rendering entails a perilous confusion with ἀποδείξεις (not to speak of τεκμήρια, or συλλογισμοί). So perilous is the confusion that when Bishop Welldon has translated ἡ δὲ πίστις ἀπόδειξις τις (1355^a 4) by "proof is a species of demonstration," he not without reason comments that "it would be more natural to argue that demonstration is a species of proof than that proof is a species of demonstration." But Aristotle's meaning is that argumentative persuasion is a sort—an inferior sort—of demonstration: the enthymeme, in fact, is an inferior sort of syllogism, which he actually says a moment later in the same Greek way, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα συλλογισμός τις. The whole of the sentence will run in English, "Persuasion is clearly a sort of demonstration, since we are most fully persuaded (πιστεύομεν μάλιστα: ordinary belief passes into reasoned conviction) when we consider a thing to have been demonstrated (ἀποδεδείχθαι: cp. τῷ ἀποδεδείχθαι πείθονται, 1403^b 12)." As we may see from this passage and from a still more suggestive one in the *De Anima* (428^a 19 ff.), Aristotle is very much alive, notwithstanding the fact that the term had probably long been technical, to the connexion of πίστις with πείθειν and to the persuasive (rather than

demonstrative) character of all purely rhetorical methods of producing belief, these being mainly concerned with clues and probabilities and not with scientific certainties. So that we want, in English, some word in which this element of persuasion appears clearly. It is not easy to find, or it would have been found before now. Hobbes's sense of logic and his command of English lead to nothing more distinctive than "proofs" (even "arguments" would be better than this) in his *Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique*. I once thought of "persuasives," which I see that Professor W. D. Ross employs in his recent monograph on Aristotle. An objection to this is that it might be thought to cover pecuniary inducements; and poor as Aristotle's opinion of some of the rhetorical *πίστεις* is, he does not reckon bribes among them. "Suasions" had also occurred to me; but this may err on the other side—it may suggest too much of *moral* suasion. Badly as we need a single word when rendering a constantly recurring technical term, we must (I fear) make shift with "modes (or, sources) of persuasion," unless some briefer equivalent can be recovered or invented by our colleagues the English philologists. If "proofs" be retained, it should be qualified by the adjective "probable" or "rhetorical" (as contrasted with "positive" or "scientific"). "Evidences" would seem unsuitable, if only on the ground that *μάρτυρες* is one of the subdivisions of the *ἄτεχνοι πίστεις* (1375^a 24).—Like "persuasion" or "assurance" in English, *πίστις* appears—in Aristotle—to oscillate between passive and active senses: *πειθώ*, which is frequent in Plato's *Gorgias*, is rare in Aristotle, though it is found in the passage of the *De Anima* referred to above.—It is worth notice that when the technical term *αἱ πίστεις* first occurs in the *Rhetoric* (1354^a 13), no definition is offered of it, any more than of *ἐνθύμημα* which is found in the following line and is simply said to be *σῶμα τῆς πίστεως* (the formal definition coming in 1356^b 4). Some knowledge of such terms could be taken for granted since not only had Aristotle himself already written books on the subject but, as he makes clear at the end of the *Sophistic Elenchi*, the whole field of rhetoric, in its more technical aspects, had been carefully tilled long before his day.

In 1355^a 1 the words *ὥσπερ πρότερον εἶπομεν* raise two inter-

esting questions: the Greek use of author's plural, and the value of the *Vetusta Translatio* as an authority for the text. The former question is too far-reaching for treatment in these notes. But it is well known that, when referring to his own writings in the past or future, Aristotle uses the plural number, and that the observance or contravention of this usage will often serve as a test of authenticity (e. g. in the case of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*). The *πολὺν χρόνον ἐπονοῦμεν* which is Aristotle's quiet way of indicating his discovery of the syllogism (*Soph. El.*, ad f.) forms a striking contrast to (say) the *δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἔγωγε* with which a late Peripatetic (Demetrius, *de Elocutione*, § 15) asserts his claim to originality in a matter comparatively so trifling as the use of the periodic form in literary composition. Isocrates' use of plural and singular (in both verbs and pronouns) should also be examined, together with certain similarities, accidental or inherited, in the writings of Cicero. To Aristotle's use of the plural in the way above described there seem to be two exceptions only. One is in the *De Partibus Animalium* (647^a 5), where most manuscripts give *ὥσπερ εἶπον πρότερον* but one has the plural *εἵπομεν*. The other exception is in the *Rhetoric* (I. c. 1, 1355^a 2), where all the manuscripts (including A^c) have *ὥσπερ πρότερον εἶπον*. Here William of Moerbeke comes to the rescue; his *diximus* seems to show that *εἵπομεν* stood in the manuscript from which he was translating—a manuscript which may have been older than any other extant manuscript of the *Rhetoric* except A^c. Friar William (the good monk, the "bonus monachus" as Roemer rather patronisingly calls him) is still excellent company even when he nods drowsily as the rosy streaks spread, in the Homeric dawn of our recorded history, like human fingers across a brightening tract of land and sea. In the amusing passage (*Rhet.* 1405^b 18-20) in which Aristotle tells us that it makes all the difference whether you say, with Homer, "rosy-fingered morn" or (on your own account) "crimson-fingered morn" or (worse still) "red-fingered morn," William of Moerbeke unblushingly translates *ροδοδάκτυλος ἥως* by "*rododactylus* (apparently the Latin name for some primeval monster) *quam ut* (ἢ ὥς)"! Monastic sloth? No; Friar William was a meritorious scholar for his time; his very blunders are endearing, and

his literal simplicity is often a real help to us today in reconstructing the Greek text that lay before him.

The *Vetusta* must, obviously, be used with much caution; and sometimes it fails us altogether. We cannot, I think, draw any safe inference from the absence in it of any equivalent of τε in διά τε τὸ κτλ., 1355^a 21. In this passage, however, we may feel inclined to follow Dionysius (*First Letter to Ammaeus*, c. 6) in reading διά γε τὸ κτλ., and in general Dionysius' quotations deserve careful examination. In constituting any new text of the *Rhetoric*, Roemer's Teubner edition would form a good, though not an absolutely trustworthy, starting-point. Roemer's remark about Cope's text is caustic: "talem textum post egregiam Spengelii operam lucem vidisse in patria Bentleii, iure mireris." The great fault of Cope, as compared with Spengel and Roemer, is that he neglects or repudiates (often, however, in Immanuel Bekker's company) many excellent readings found in the best manuscript, the famous Paris codex (Parisinus 1741, = A^o) which contains not only Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, but the *De Elocutione* of Demetrius and the *De Compositione Verborum* of Dionysius, together with various other Greek rhetorical or literary treatises. P 1741 is not without serious blemishes of its own, such as those I have noted when editing the *De Elocutione* and the *De Compositione*; but for the *Rhetoric* it is of supreme importance, and all material deviations from it should be scrupulously reported. I may add, by the way, that but few passages which it presents to us should, in my opinion, be regarded as spurious. Part of the section (towards the end of the First Book) on evidence given under torture is clearly un-Aristotelian in language; and difficulties are presented by a longer passage towards the end of the Second Book. In the Third Book one wonders whether some of the rather elementary remarks on points of grammar are due to later interpolation or to the infancy of grammatical science in Aristotle's own day. So, too, with the observations on correct Greek (ἐλληνίζειν), and the reference to the "Attic Orators" (οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ῥήτορες): things which perhaps suggest an Alexandrian rather than an Attic viewpoint.

Reverting to Roemer and his strictures on Cope, I am bound to point out that his own text (in its revised and final edition,

published in 1898 during his lifetime) is deformed by many errors. The *corrigenda* I have marked in my working copy average at least one per page on each of his 235 pages: errors—slips or misprints—either in the text proper or in the critical footnotes. To all this must be added his ill-based dogmatism (whenever he says “ego scripsi” or “ego inserui,” the odds are you think the change is one for the worse), and his frequent desire to impose upon Aristotle too rigid a uniformity in word and thought. These criticisms imply no ignoble wish to decry German scholarship generally: the Berlin Aristotle is enough to save one from that. Any new recension of the text would be greatly indebted to the labours both of Spengel and of Roemer, but I hope it would not fail to enter in the critical footnotes most of Bywater’s suggestions and many of Herbert Richards’s, as indicating difficulties which British scholars have felt and tried to solve.

The end, as well as the beginning, of Aristotle’s Preface is effective. It serves to bring home to us what is still the crux of the whole matter. Aristotle failed to accomplish, for his pupils and for the general public of his and later ages, one all-important thing: he failed to invent a new term which should mark off the vicious from the good variety of rhetoric. It is near the end of his *προοίμιον* that he makes, with shrewd comments, the observation that there is no special Greek term to denote the sophistical rhetorician, whereas the sophistical dialectician has the name of “sophist.” *ῥήτωρ*, in fact has to do double duty—for a *trained speaker* and for a *tricky speaker*. The passage in question (1355^b 17-21) has sometimes been misunderstood. It may be translated as follows: “What makes a man a ‘sophist’ is not his faculty, but his moral purpose. In rhetoric, however, the term ‘rhetorician’ may describe either the speaker’s knowledge of the art or his moral purpose. In dialectic it is different: a man is a ‘sophist’ because he has a certain kind of moral purpose, a ‘dialectician’ in respect, not of his moral purpose, but of his faculty.” Herbert Richards (*Aristotelica*, p. 104) strangely says that there is no authority for “understanding *ῥήτωρ* in a bad sense, not *rhetorician* but *unscrupulous speaker*.” Apart from Plato, the fact that Aristotle sometimes (e. g. *Top.* 149^b 29) finds it convenient to

qualify *ρήτωρ* by *ἀγαθός*, and Isocrates (e. g. *De Pace*, § 129) by *πονηρός*, seems to show that the word was at least ambiguous.

Jebb's translation of the above passage in the *Rhetoric* is: "For the essence of Sophistry is not in the faculty but in the moral purpose: only, in the case of Rhetoric, a man is to be called a rhetorician with respect to his faculty, without distinction of his moral purpose." Here "with respect to his faculty" is clearly a slip for "with respect to his knowledge (his scientific skill)," the Greek being *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην* (not *κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν*). Some other slips and flaws in Jebb's rendering of the first chapter will be found at the following places: 1354^a 20, 24, 34; 1354^b 23; 1355^a 4, 23, 24; 1355^b 3, 4. The whole problem of translating Aristotle is difficult, or rather insoluble. Regarded as the first draft of a busy College Lecturer, Jebb's translation is a fine production; and many minor blemishes in it would have disappeared if he had revised it for publication. In the hands of so admirable a writer of English, Aristotle retains, in a high degree, his brevity, force, and point. Possibly the ordinary English reader, for whom a translation printed without the Greek text is mainly intended, would have been helped and attracted to a greater extent by a version which, with some sacrifice of terseness, was more self-explanatory and less abstruse. Such a version might, to many, have been more *εὐανάγνωστος*: especially if it used such modern helps to the eye (dashes, italics, careful punctuation, capital letters, numbered headings, and the like) as Aristotle would himself have welcomed with avidity. In the rendering of technical terms Jebb does not, I think, aim at any rigid consistency; there he seems to me to be right. On the whole, the English reader loses rather than gains by a pedantic uniformity in matters of this kind.

It is not till his Preface, with its many criticisms and general anticipatory remarks, is over that Aristotle, making (as he says) a fresh start, frames his definition of rhetoric: "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion (*ἔστω δὴ ἡ ῥητορικὴ δύναμις περὶ ἕκαστον τοῦ θεωρῆσαι τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν*, 1355^b 25)." The definition contains no direct reference to *speech*,—to the "*ars dicendi*": the word *ρητορικὴ* makes this unnecessary. *ῥητορικὴ* also implies *τέχνη*; and so not *τέχνη* but *δύναμις* ("the power of") follows. Rhetoric is both art and faculty. Like the

Preface, the word θεωρῆσαι must be borne in mind throughout the treatise: we must "observe," *but not necessarily employ*, all the possible means of producing belief. A little earlier (1355^b 10), Aristotle has said of rhetoric: οὐ τὸ πείσαι ἔργον αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἰδεῖν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πιθανὰ περὶ ἕκαστον. It is with rhetoric as with the art of money-making, of which an accepted view is said, in the *Politics* (1257^b 5), to be that its function is τὸ δύνασθαι θεωρῆσαι πόθεν ἔσται πλῆθος χρημάτων. It is sometimes held that the formula ἔστω δὴ in the *Rhetoric* serves to introduce a merely popular definition. In the present case, the mode of expression is no doubt easy and even casual, but the substance is of a scientific exactitude. On no other conditions can Aristotle the philosopher undertake to discuss the art of rhetoric.

In 1356^a 30, 31 (ἔστι γὰρ μῶριόν τι τῆς διαλεκτικῆς καὶ ὁμοία, καθάπερ καὶ ἀρχόμενοι εἵπομεν), we should, with A^o, read ὁμοία, as here given. Jebb, following Cope and the inferior manuscripts which all have ὁμοίωμα, translates "an image of Dialectic." But ὁμοία is confirmed by 1359^b 11, where the inferior manuscripts unite with A^o in giving ὁμοία δ' ἐστὶν (ἡ ῥητορική) . . . τῇ διαλεκτικῇ. As he proceeds, Aristotle has modified the arresting statement with which he opened his book, and here says, less strongly and picturesquely, that rhetoric is a "branch of dialectic and resembles it."—In 1356^b 4, 9, 20, further textual help can be had from Dionysius, and in 1357^a 20 from the *Vetusta*.—In 1356^b 30, Jebb gives, for δείκνυσθαι διὰ τοιούτων, "to be demonstrated by *persons* who are so." Must it not rather be "to be proved by means of *things* (*statements*) that are so"? Jebb's renderings of 1356^b 23-25, 36 ("for" looks like a misprint for "from"), 1357^a 28, and 1357^b 14, seem open to exception. In 1357^b 30-36, the connexion of thought would appear (as against Jebb's version) to be: "Dionysius, in asking as he does (= τὴν φυλακὴν, 'his bodyguard') for a bodyguard, is scheming to make himself a despot. For in the past Peisistratus kept asking for a bodyguard in order to carry out such a scheme (cp. διὰ τοῦτο, l. 35), and did make himself a despot as soon as he got it . . . all these being instances of the one general principle, that a man who asks for a bodyguard is scheming to make himself a despot." The Greek word-order would appear to indicate that the last clause means, literally,

"that it is the man who is scheming . . . who asks . . . <and nobody else>."—In 1360^a 13 Herbert Richards (*Aristotelica*, p. 104) says of καὶ τίνων τ' ἐξαγωγῆς δέονται καὶ τίνων εἰσαγωγῆς, ἵνα πρὸς τούτους καὶ συνθῆται καὶ συμβολαὶ γίνωνται, that "'standing in need' of the export of certain things, though a possible, is certainly a rather odd expression. Should not ἐξαγωγῆς καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς change places so as to soften it?" But δέονται means, as usual, "demand," "call for," and the modern economist would agree that, for a country's well-being, exportation of goods is imperatively necessary, no less than importation. On the other hand, Richards is right in accepting the loose use of τούτους. It means "the countries concerned," and shows how vague (in form) that prince of lecturers, Aristotle, can sometimes be. In their desire for clearness, some modern lecturers have been known to fight shy of pronouns altogether.

In 1357^a 13-17, the underlined qualifications in Aristotle's description of the enthymeme have often been overlooked: "The enthymeme and the example must, then, deal with what is *in the main* contingent, the example being an induction, and the enthymeme a syllogism, about such matters. The enthymeme must consist of few propositions, fewer *often* than those which make up the normal syllogism."

In 1358^a 23, the *Vetusta* may be right in the support it gives to the βέλτιον of the inferior manuscripts. Its Latin for the whole sentence is: "circa nullum enim subiectum sunt, haec autem quanto quis utique melius elegerit propositiones latebit faciens aliam scientiam a dialectica et rhetorica." Here we can hardly doubt what the Greek original was for each of these Latin words. Sometimes we cannot be so sure. Roemer (p. 5) thinks that "prava agere" implies ποιεῖν or πράττειν, whereas our Greek manuscripts give τὰ φαῦλα πείθειν; but may not the Latin translator be combining the senses of "do" and "plead"? Spengel (I, p. 171) says, with reference to 1354^b 32, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἔργου ἐστὶν ἀναλαβεῖν τὸν ἀκροατήν, *sed prae opere est per singula captare auditorem*: "desunt Graecis verba *per singula* neque intelligo." May not the translator think that ἀνα- means "step by step"? In 1368^a 25 (ἡ ὑπεροχὴ δοκεῖ μηνύειν ἀρετήν), Spengel (I, p. 214) proposes to substitute "indicare" for "insinuare" in the Latin rendering "excellētia videtur insinuare virtutem," forgetting that, in writers of this period, "insinuare"

means "indicare." The sense which the translator attaches to ἀγαπητόν in 1365^b 16, 19, is not quite clear, but he hardly goes as far as "unique," which μετ' ἄλλων in l. 17 seems to exclude. It is curious that, in the ten passages in which πρεσβύτεροι (or the singular) is found, the translator—slavishly literal though he usually is—only once uses "seniores," everywhere else "senes." As the one exception (1395^a 3) is formed by elderly men who use wise saws and as, further, the Spartan γέροντες (1398^a 15) are Latinized as "seniores," we might conjecture that the distinction was one of worth and dignity—that only the "seniores et saniores" deserve the comparative. But this view seems to be contradicted by 1384^a 34, 1385^b 25, and 1413^b 1, in all of which cases men of consideration are concerned. It must be admitted, too, that Aristotle himself probably did not intend much difference between γέρονσι in 1390^b 4 and πρεσβύτεροι in 1390^b 6 and would have been content with the Latin he is given,—“senibus” and “senes.” The use, in classical and later Greek, of the degrees of comparison, and the special meanings of πρεσβύτερος, form a large subject on which one would like to probe into the mind of the priest who, born in Flanders during the thirteenth century, became Bishop of Corinth. Besides Spengel and Roemer, Dittmeyer's dissertation *Quaeratio inter Vetustam Aristotelis Rhetoricorum Translationem et Graecos Codices intercedat* (Munich, 1883) is sound and helpful. The Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies, whose objects have lately been described clearly and persuasively by Professor G. R. Coffman, will not forget the attractive field opened up by Latin translations from the Greek. Outside that field, Giraldus Cambrensis is an important figure. As a Welshman, I should much like to know whether the "senior quidam" who, at the end of the *Descriptio Kambriae*, is alleged to have delivered that remarkable prophecy as to the survival of the Welsh language, was or was not simply "an elderly man"; and, still more, what was the language in which he addressed King Henry II.

The *Rhetoric*, in those larger aspects which make its minute philological study perennially worth while, is full of present-day interest. The United States financiers who have lately been taking an active and fruitful part in suggesting remedies for the troubles of unhappy Europe will, it is to be hoped, be the

better able to advise and warn their own country because of experience acquired abroad: "A comprehensive view of these questions (questions of national finance) cannot be gained solely from experience in home affairs; in order to advise on such matters a man must be keenly interested in the methods worked out in other lands (1359^b 30-32)." Jebb's "to be acquainted with the discoveries of others" hardly brings out the full force of *ιστορικὸν εἶναι* which implies the eager *curiosity* (of the best kind), and the spirit of *research*, that should always animate those who, whether as students or as men of affairs, have some glimpse of *ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα φιλοσοφία*.

Another important passage of which the concluding words have sometimes been misrendered is 1359^b 9-16. The translation should, I think, run as follows: "The truth is that rhetoric is a combination of the science of logic and of the ethical branch of politics; and it is partly like dialectic, partly like sophistical reasoning. But the more we try to make either dialectic or rhetoric not, what they really are, practical faculties, but sciences, the more we shall inadvertently be destroying their true nature; for we shall be passing into the region of sciences dealing with definite subjects rather than simply with words and forms of reasoning." The passage explains clearly the nature of dialectic and rhetoric, and the way in which they differ from particular sciences. The concluding Greek words are: *ἀλλὰ μὴ μόνον λόγων*. Welldon, following Cope, translates by "mere words." But some implication of rational discussion (*λόγος*, *ratio* as well as *oratio*) is surely present where dialectic is concerned; and, as a matter of fact, both dialectic and rhetoric have, a little way back, been described as *δυνάμεις τοῦ πορίσαι λόγους*, "faculties of providing arguments" (not "of providing words"). If Aristotle wished to say, in our sense, "they fight about words," his expression would, I think, be *μάχονται περὶ ὀνομάτων*. The phrase "mere words," inadequate in itself, is also calculated to prejudice the English reader who has a logical bent. It is the logical, and (if we may so say) the psychological, sides of rhetoric that Aristotle puts first (in Book I and Book II respectively): Book III, the *περὶ Λέξεως*, seems to be a kind of grudging afterthought and may have been separately issued.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

IV.—PTOLEMY'S SKANDIA.

The *Geography* of the 2d cy. Egyptian geographer Claudius Ptolemy contains, among other things, an account of the island Skandia.¹ Ptolemy describes the island as follows:² 'Απ' ἀνατολῶν δὲ τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου τέσσαρες νῆσοι αἱ καλούμεναι Σκανδίαι, τρεῖς μὲν μικραὶ . . . μία δὲ μεγίστη καὶ ἀνατολικωτάτη κατὰ τὰς ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Οὐιστούλα ποταμοῦ . . . Καλεῖται δὲ ἰδίως καὶ αὕτῃ Σκανδία, καὶ κατέχουσιν αὐτῆς τὰ μὲν δυτικὰ Χαιδεῖνοί, τὰ δ' ἀνατολικά Φανόναι καὶ Φιραῖσοι, τὰ δὲ ἀρκτικά Φίννοι, τὰ δὲ μεσημβρινὰ Γούται καὶ Δαυκίῳνες, τὰ δὲ μέσα Λευῶνοι. This description is obviously meager and obscure enough, yet it gives us more geographical information than anything else we possess up to the time of Jordanes. Ptolemy thus becomes our chief authority for the political subdivisions of the Scandinavian peninsula during the early centuries of our era.

Scientific study of the Ptolemaic geography is still in its beginnings. For a discussion of the problems and the methods adapted to their solution, see especially G. Schütte, *Ptolemy's Maps of Northern Europe*, Copenhagen, 1917. For Skandia proper, see also J. V. Svensson, in *Namn och Bygd* VII 1 ff. The matter of orthography in particular is troublesome. On this point Schütte, after a long examination of numerous Ptolemaic misspellings, concludes:³ "To a great extent, the present Ptolemaic orthography of exotic barbarian names must be regarded simply as a field of ruins. If therefore we examine each name separately, it would in many cases lead to nothing. Our chief key of identification must be a survey of the entire milieu. If we take a whole series of names instead of the single ones, there is a certain amount of hope that we may solve the riddles. A skilful Procrustes may distort single names into complete obscurity, but he will rarely be able to do the same with an entire complexus of them, if he does not at the same time disturb their natural order." Schütte's point is obviously well taken. In at least one case, however, he fails to follow his

¹ As everybody knows, the ancients thought Scandinavia an island.

² Ed. Karl Müller, Paris, 1883, vol. I, p. 276.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

own method, and inasmuch as the case in question concerns us nearly, I will take it up in some detail.

Tacitus, in cap. 44 of his *Germania* (98 A. D.),⁴ gives a comparatively long and accurate account of the Suiones or Swedes. He speaks of them as living *ipso in Oceano* 'in Ocean itself,' and adds, *subitos hostium incursus prohibet Oceanus* 'Ocean forbids sudden incursions of enemies.' From this we may infer that Tacitus thought of the tribe as living on an island, or on a group of islands, as the Ålands. Now in fact the Swedes lived in Scandinavia, which Ptolemy knows as the island Skandia. And yet Ptolemy's list of Skandian tribes does not include the Suiones. Naturally enough, Schütte, and others before him, on the basis of the historical facts, argued that the name *Suiones* must have stood in Ptolemy's original list. They therefore proceeded to restore it to the list by a process of emendation. Schütte remodeled the tribe-name Φανόναι: v. Grienberger and Bremer, the name Λευῶνοι. Both emendations are obviously violent, and unlikely to gain general acceptance. At the same time, the argument that the Suiones ought to be in Ptolemy is a good argument, and the actual absence of the name would want explanation. What did Ptolemy do with the Suiones? As a matter of fact, he has them, I think, but he has put them not in Skandia but on the southeast shore of the Baltic. If we turn to the Ptolemaic description of European Sarmatia⁵ we read a list of tribes said to live on the right bank of the Vistula. Going upstream (i. e., south), we find, in order, the names Φίννοι, Σούλωνες, Φρουγουνδίωνες, Αὔαρινοί, Ὀμβρωνες. Four of these names are easily recognizable: Finns, Burgundians, Varini and Ambrones. An easy emendation (i for l), already suggested, indeed, by Müller, gives us as the fifth tribe the Suiones. And this emendation is compelling, for we know that the Suiones dwelt between the (Scrid-)Finns, i. e., Lapps, and the Burgundians (of Bornholm), the former being to their north, the latter to their south. Furthermore, Schütte has proved that our list of names properly belongs, not along the right bank of the Vistula, but along the southern (and southeastern) shore of the Baltic. For the explanation of the Ptole-

⁴ Ed. Schweizer-Sidler (7th ed. Schwyzer), pp. 89 f.

⁵ Ed. cit., I 423 f.

maic displacement I must refer the reader to Schütte.⁶ We can now see also why the Swedes appear on the Continent instead of on the island of Skandia. In Ptolemy's day the Burgundians actually held lands on both sides the Baltic, in Pomerania as well as in Bornholm. And tribes known as Finns likewise lived east as well as north of the Baltic. When the Ptolemaic sources were consolidated, then, and when there took place that elimination of duplicates which any consolidation involves, the Swedes, who actually lived between Burgundians and Finns, were by an easy error located between the Burgundians and Finns of the southeastern Baltic coast, instead of in Skandia. Such a location would become imperative, indeed, if the Burgundians were to be confined to Pomerania, as actually happened. From all this it follows that the Swedes appear in Ptolemy, but that he locates them in European Sarmatia. Hence we must abandon, as wrong in principle, any attempt to read or emend them into Ptolemaic Skandia as well.—If the Ests and Livonians were offshoots of the Swedes, as some scholars believe,⁷ the Ptolemaic localization of the Swedes may even be looked upon as in a way correct.

My discussion of the Suiones has at least a negative bearing on our problem. We know that the Swedes do not belong in Ptolemy's Skandia. And with this knowledge we are able to approach with some confidence another question, viz., the question of Ptolemy's orientation. Did Ptolemy gain his knowledge of Skandia from the east or from the west? Tacitus clearly got his information from the east. Hence he knows the Swedes and the east Baltic generally. Ptolemy however seems to have based his map of Skandia on a western source (which we may call Sk), a source ignorant of the Swedes and all the east. And although Ptolemy doubtless had a map on which the Swedish name appeared, he did not associate this map with Skandia at all, but, as we have seen, incorporated it into his map of European Sarmatia. It is worth noting that the name *Scadinavia* (with its variant forms) reached the classical world through western sources, and that Tacitus, whose information about the North came to him from the east, knows nothing of the name,

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 127 f.

⁷ See, e. g., Noreen, in *Fornvännen* XV 35 ff.

in contradistinction to Pliny, who got his information from the west.⁸

Let us now proceed to an examination of the tribe-names actually recorded for Skandia. Ptolemy's list may be divided into two groups. First, we have tribes living afar off: in the west, in the north, in the interior. These are the *Xaυδεῖνοι*, the *Φίρροι*, the *Λευῶνοι*. Secondly, we have tribes near at hand, i. e., close to the Cimbric Chersonesus: east and south. Of the first group, the *Xaυδεῖνοι* are usually identified with the *Heinir* of later days, who lived in the Norwegian district called *Heiðmörk*. Phonologically this identification is satisfactory. Geographically too it is passable. But one must suspect that the name *Heinir* in Ptolemy's days had a broader significance. Norway was that part of the Scandinavian world which was least affected by the civilization of the south. Its tribes therefore might well have been called 'the barbarians' by their more cultured kinsmen in the Jutland peninsula, and *Heinir* of course originally meant 'barbarians' rather than 'men of the heath.' The interpretation here suggested fits in better with the western location indicated by Ptolemy, and relieves us of having to assume knowledge (at so early a date) of a tribe rather distant from the coast. I present it for what it is worth.

Noreen has very plausibly located the *Λευῶνοι* east of Lake Vättern in the interior of Sweden. I can add nothing to his exposition, and shall content myself with a reference to his paper on the subject.⁹ From his identification of the *Φίρροι*, however, I must dissent. To make Scridfinns or Lapps of them is to put them much too far north, beyond the ken of the author of source Sk, or at any rate beyond his range of positive information. I prefer to identify them rather with the *Finni* of Jordanes, who seem to have held Värmland and westward. This region, though some distance from the coast, was accessible from the sea by way of the Gautelfr and Lake Vänern.

We now come to the tribes which Ptolemy has put in the east and south. And here the first question to be considered is that of the meaning of these geographical terms. That tribal locali-

⁸ See J. V. Svensson, in *Namn och Bygd* V 153 ff., and IX 68 bottom, 89 top.

⁹ See *Fornvännen* XV 37 f.

zations in terms of the points of the compass cannot always be taken literally is of course well known. So far as I know, however, the principles that actually governed the use of such terms have never been worked out. This is not the place to attempt the task of examining the material at our disposition here. I will content myself with a single example. The Norwegian retainer Ohthere, in his well-known description of Norway (which his lord, king Alfred, preserved to us), said that Norway was very long and very narrow. "And þæt byne land is easteward bradost, and symle swa norðor swa smælre. Easteward hit mæg bion syxtig mila brad, oppe hwene bradre; and middeward þritig oððe bradre; and norðeward he cwæð, þær hit smalost wære, þæt hit mihte beon þreora mila brad to þæm more." Here *easteward* obviously means 'southward,' and this although Norway in fact projects further to the *west* the further south one goes. Plenty of other cases of apparent misuse of the terms of direction might be cited but for lack of space. E. Hjärne has recently suggested¹⁰ that these seeming mistakes all have their source and root in Ptolemy and his successors. But I, for one, find it hard to believe that Ohthere made learned mistakes of any kind, or that the Icelandic sagamen were influenced to any great extent by Greek and Latin geographers in their application to their homeland of the homely terms north, south, east and west! In my judgment Hjärne would have come nearer the truth if he had turned his theory round, and suggested that Ptolemy and his successors got their false notions about Northern geography through a natural misunderstanding of the terms of direction used by their (ultimately) native sources of information.

Ptolemy's chief error (apart from his notion that Skandia was an island) came, I think, from such a misunderstanding. Scandia in fact runs from north to south, but he thought it to run from west to east. How did he get the idea? Here, as in the case of the name *Skandia*, the evidence points to a western source. Ohthere's use of *east* where one would expect *south* is intelligible only as a western usage. When a Northman made the voyage into the *austmarr* or even *towards* eastern waters, he would naturally look upon the various halting-places or land-

¹⁰ In *Namn och Bygd* V 73.

marks as milestones (so to speak) on his road. Each milestone would in this sense be *east* of the one before, whatever its true direction relative to the starting point. The same would apply to the Western trader, and accordingly one would expect to find, and one does find, the Cimbric Chersonesus bent to the east in Ptolemy's map. The usage under discussion is obviously logical and correct, from the point of view of the voyage as a whole, which was away into the east and back from the east. As obviously, however, it might, and did, lead the geographers astray.—Another error to which this usage gave rise was an eastward displacement of both the Cimbric Chersonesus and Skandia, the latter being thus forced into a position over against the mouth of the Vistula. This connexion with the Vistula (really fortuitous) is the true inspiration for all the theories which derive Ptolemy's source Sk from the east.

When now a Western trade ship rounded the point of Jutland and ventured further east, what part of the Scandinavian coast would she first come to? Pretty clearly (as any map will tell you) to the *häräd* now called *Fjäre*, where lived the *Feruir* of Jordanes. I therefore identify the Φιραιῖοι of Ptolemy with the Feruir. The variant readings in Müller are: Φείραιοι, Φιρέσαι, Φιρεῦσαι, Φιρᾶσαι. These readings show uncertainty in the middle syllable: the reading Φιρεῦσαι comes closest to the Jordanian form. The Ptolemaic *s* reappears as the final *r* in Jordanes, if my identification holds; in Ptolemy's day rhotacism had not yet set in. The Greek ending is probably not original. Phonologically, then, the identification is reasonably plausible. Geographically it is well fortified, since the Feruir lay on the eastern trade route and consequently would be recorded in Sk as an eastern tribe. If Sk had been an eastern rather than a western document, however, the Feruir would hardly have appeared at all, and certainly would not have been called an eastern tribe! — Schütte, following Zeuss, emends Φιραιῖοι to Φιναιῖοι.¹¹ The emendation obviously does not grow out of the Ptolemaic text, and must be looked upon as violent.

What gave the Feruir their importance, and caused their name to be noted on the trade route map Sk? The chances are that the traders had a *dépôt* amongst them. The fact that they

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

were the *first* tribe reached also had its importance, doubtless, when the map came to be drawn. But a trade route map must have at least two names, and if it has only two the second name must be that of the *last* tribe reached, at the journey's end. The voyage under consideration proceeded, one may suspect, much like that of Ohthere, and Ohthere on his eastern voyage, as we know, skirted what is now the west coast of Sweden until he came to Selund. He did not go into the Sound, however, but crossed over, skirted the west coast of Selund, entered the Great Belt, skirted Fyn and finally arrived at the port now called Slesvig. Our antique voyagers seem to have followed the same course. Their voyage ended with the Φαρόναι, however, whom I identify with the inhabitants of Fyn, the ancient Fionia, the Fjón of the Icelanders. If this identification holds, the Ptolemaic form has suffered a slight corruption: it should read Φευόναι.

But the eastern route was not the only one open to the Western trader. He might also venture upon a northern voyage. In so doing he could use as a base of supplies his *dépôt* among the Feruir, and by utilizing the streams and lakes he would be able to penetrate far into the interior. The northern route seems to have led up the Gautelfr and across Lake Vänern. To be compared is the expedition led by king Haraldr Harðráði, from Snorri's account of which I take the following passage:¹²

En er á leið sumarit, helt Haraldr konungr suðr til Konungahellu; síðan tók hann léttiskip öll, þau er hann fekk, ok helt upp eptir Elfinni; lét hann draga af við forsa ok flutti skipin upp í vatnit Væni. Síðan ræri hann austr yfir vatnit, þar sem hann spurði til Hákonar jarls.

At the northern end of this route lived the Finni of Jordanes, and to the west of these the Heinir of Heiðmörk. If one penetrated still deeper into the interior, one came to the Ljunar, beyond Lake Vättern, whom Noreen (and Lindroth) have identified with Ptolemy's Λευῶναι. At the southern end of the route lived the Gautar, who held the valley of the Gautelfr (their very name, indeed, was derived from that of the stream). Ptolemy's Γούραι are usually, and with justice, identified with the Gautar. We are under no necessity, however, of emending the

¹² *Heimskringla, Haraldssaga Harðráða* cap. 72.

Ptolemaic form, as the commentators regularly do (if they accept the identification). The Gautar were a branch of the Goths, as we know from Jordanes, and it is to be presumed that Ptolemy knew the tribe by their generic rather than by their specific name.

The *Δαυκίωες* remain. They were clearly neighbors of the Gautar, and perhaps lived in south Bohuslän. Of their exact location however we cannot be sure, since neither name nor folk has survived. R. W. Chambers, in his edition of the English poem *Widsith*, points out¹³ that there might well be a connexion between Ptolemy's *Δαυκίωες* and the *Deanas* referred to¹⁴ in l. 63 of the English poem. Chambers says, "As the context makes it probable that they [the Deanas] are a Scandinavian people, it is tempting to suppose that, by a mistake of an Old English or a Greek copyist, they are the same people as are mentioned by Ptolemy as *Δαυκίωες*, and located by him in the south of Sweden, but whom it has been impossible to trace in any other document." Chambers is undoubtedly correct in supposing that the two names refer to the same tribe. He is wrong, however, in postulating any scribal errors, unless it be the use of the ending *-ωες* for *-wes*. The *k* of *Daukiones* probably stands for a Germanic *h*, like the *c* of *Cimbri*, *Chauci*. The extant English form can perfectly well go back to an earlier **Deahnum*. The forms in Ptolemy and in the *Widsith* thus correspond with great precision. The tribal name doubtless was built up on the base *dauh/daug*, familiar to us in the verb *dugan* 'be of worth.'—The *Δαυκίωες* are frequently identified with the Danes, but this identification can be made only by assuming that the Ptolemaic name-form is corrupt, and in view of its exact correspondence to the name-form in the *Widsith* the Ptolemaic form must be accepted as it stands.

The form *Δαυκίωες* casts further light on the provenience of Ptolemy's source Sk. The use of *k* or *c* (instead of *h* or *ch*) to represent the Germanic *h* is characteristic of the Celts.¹⁵ To put it in phonetic terms, the ancient Celt, like the modern Englishman, substituted his voiceless velar stop for the voiceless

¹³ P. 210 note.

¹⁴ In the dat. pl., *Deanum*.

¹⁵ See Noreen, in *Fornvännen* XV 23.

velar spirant of his Germanic neighbors. The tribal name *Δαυκίῳνες*, then, owes its form to Celtic transmission. But this stamps source Sk as western, and confirms the other evidence pointing in the same direction.—In this connexion ought to be mentioned the Ptolemaic location of the three small Skandias. These are placed between the Jutland peninsula and Skandia proper. The location is correct enough, if the islands in question are Fyn, Læland and Sjælland, the three chief islands of the Danish archipelago. Ptolemy however evidently knows nothing of Bornholm, Öland and Gotland, further east, and his general description of the Skandias thus indicates that his source of information was of western origin.

KEMP MALONE.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

V.—A SUPPOSED HISTORICAL DISCREPANCY IN THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

In the eighth Platonic Epistle, 355e, it is proposed to make a son of Dion king at Syracuse. Yet Dion's only son had died before his father, some time before the eighth Epistle was written. Here then is a discrepancy that casts doubt on the genuineness of the eighth Epistle. It furthermore happens to be the only point on which there is difficulty in reconciling the statements of the Epistles with the account of events given by Plutarch and Diodorus. My purpose in the present article is to propose a solution of the difficulty that will, I believe, be an added argument for the genuineness of the seventh and eighth Epistles, since it indicates certain features in them that are in striking harmony with the view that they were composed by Plato to deal in each case with a particular situation.

The historical facts are as follows. Dion's only son committed suicide shortly before his father's assassination by Callippus.¹ This son's name was Hipparinus or, according to another authority, Aretaeus.² After Dion's death, about the beginning of the year 353 B. C., Callippus became ruler of Syracuse for thirteen months.³ In the meantime Dion's loyal followers took refuge with Hiketas in Leontini.⁴ Dion's wife Arete was in prison at Syracuse, where she gave birth to a posthumous son, who is nowhere named.⁵ Plato's message to Dion's friends, contained in the seventh Epistle, was composed during this period.

In the year 352 Dion's nephew Hipparinus, son of Dionysius the Elder and half-brother of Dionysius the Younger, captured Syracuse and released, with the rest of Dion's family, his posthumous son less than a year old.⁶ Since this success of Hipparinus is referred to in the eighth Epistle, it must have been written, if by Plato, at about this time.

¹ Plutarch, *Dion*, 55.

² Plutarch, *Dion*, 31.

³ Diodorus XVI, 31, 7.

⁴ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 1.

⁵ Plutarch, *Dion*, 57.

⁶ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5; Plutarch, *Dion*, 58.

Hipparinus died in 350.⁷ Hiketas of Leontini later deserted the cause of Dion and caused Dion's family to be murdered, among them the nameless son born posthumously in prison.⁸

There are two questions to be dealt with in connection with the seventh and eighth Epistles. In the first place, who is the Hipparinus referred to in the introduction to the seventh Epistle (324a)? This question has been satisfactorily discussed by Adam,⁹ with whom Howalt (*Die Briefe Platons*, Zurich, 1923) in his note on this passage agrees. Dion's son Hipparinus Aretaeus (he probably received the second name to distinguish him from his cousin) was dead. In any case, if Plato had supposed him to be alive, he would have mentioned him in different terms from those which he actually uses. The Hipparinus of the letter is said to be of the same age as Dion at a time when the latter was twenty years old.¹⁰ This is too old for Dion's son, whom Plutarch calls ἀντίπαις,¹¹ that is, not yet eighteen years old. It is not too young for Dion's nephew, even if we hold the writer to the exact year. Dionysius married Dion's sister Aristomache in 398,¹² and we have no reason to doubt that she might have borne sons twenty-five years later at the age of forty. Moreover, it evidently did not occur to Plutarch that this Hipparinus could be Dion's son, for if it had, he would have cited Plato as authority for the name, when he made that a subject of discussion (Dion 31). Since the nephew Hipparinus was actually in command of support at Leontini a little later, it is natural to suppose that he was being considered by Dion's friends as a possible leader shortly after Dion's death. Some have thought that there is a reference to this nephew of Dion in Ep. VII, 328a, where it is suggested that the companionship of Dion's nephews would be an incitement to Dionysius to study philosophy (in the year 367), and that consequently he must

⁷ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5.

⁸ Plutarch, Dion, 58; Timoleon, 33.

⁹ R. Adam, *Die Echtheit der Platonischen Briefe*, Programm, Berlin, 1906.

¹⁰ Ep. VII, 324a. If Nepos is accurate in giving Dion's age at death as 55 years, he must have been at least twenty years old when Plato first visited Syracuse in 388.

¹¹ Plutarch, Dion 55.

¹² Diodorus XIV, 45, 1.

have been more than twenty years old in 353. If, however, we can trust the scholiast on Epistle IV, the brothers of Dionysius the Elder had both married sisters of Dion. Hence there existed in all probability at the Syracusan court many nephews of Dion of about the same age as Dionysius the Younger, and this reference would be to them and not to Hipparinus. There is accordingly no discrepancy involved in identifying the Hipparinus of the seventh Epistle with the nephew of Dion who was preparing to lead Dion's friends against Callippus.

The question that concerns the eighth Epistle, however, is still in need of an answer. The writer of that Epistle refers (355e) to a son of Dion as being alive when the letter was written, more than a year after Dion's only son had met his death. There are just four possible methods of explaining this reference: 1. The writer did not know of the death of Dion's son. 2. The writer is referring to Dion's second son born posthumously. 3. Our authorities are wrong and Dion's son had *not* died. 4. Our authorities are wrong in their statement that it was Dion's *only* son who died.

All of these methods have found scholars to advocate them at some time. No one in recent years has, however, adopted the second among the four possibilities, in spite of the fact that it is the only one that avoids the difficulties involved in supposing that Plutarch and Plato were in disagreement. That the solution of the problem really lies after all in supposing that it is Dion's posthumous infant who is referred to in the eighth Epistle is, I believe, proved by certain considerations that I proceed to state.

We have in the first place two convincing arguments for this view. To begin with, Plutarch, who was well informed about all that concerns Plato and Dion, evidently agreed with this view, for he would otherwise certainly have discussed the discrepancy between his account and Plato's. His discussion of a less important disagreement elsewhere (Dion 20) makes this plain. Plutarch's interpretation deserves to be decisive unless there are strong arguments against it that Plutarch was not capable of estimating properly; and such arguments do not exist.

My second convincing argument is based on the curious way in which Plato, in the passage of the eighth Epistle that has

been referred to, introduces Dion's son merely as a representative of his father and grandfather. It is proposed to create three kings, all descendants of the original Hipparinus and Dionysius. In the case of each of the other two candidates for kingship Plato makes the most of the man's name and of any worthy achievements or characteristics that he has to his credit. Dion's son apparently is nameless and undistinguished in what he has done and in what he is. The only possible explanation for such featurelessness is that the son referred to is precisely the nameless infant who had just come to light. Rightly considered Plato's reticence fairly shouts the truth in our ears. Coupled with Plutarch's silence it is overwhelming evidence.

In addition to the foregoing, moreover, we have strongly corroborative items of evidence. There are two circumstances worthy of note which, on any other view, demand an explanation that is not to be elicited. Once considered in the light of the interpretation here proposed, however, they become significant and harmonize perfectly with the series of events. In the first place, why, if a son of Dion was known to be in existence throughout, is he mentioned only in the eighth Epistle, and not at all (as a successor to Dion) in the seventh, whose author is so concerned to vindicate the memory of Dion and to ensure the continuance of his political program and party? A living son of Dion would surely have received the allegiance of his friends; in that case no one would have turned to Hipparinus the nephew. The author of the seventh Epistle knew that Dion's son was dead; the author of the eighth was willing to make the most of the fortunate discovery of a posthumous infant who might represent his cause.

The second circumstance which is illuminated by the present interpretation is Plutarch's twice repeated statement that Hiktas of Leontini had Dion's sister, wife and infant son destroyed at sea. Plato's eighth letter evidently had its effect, and Dion's son did become a focus for the loyalty of Dion's followers. We have a striking parallel to the situation of this infant in the strife that centered about the posthumous son of Alexander the Great, thirty years later. In the confusion that followed the death of his father he was doomed to perish, the innocent victim of a heritage too great for a helpless babe.

Up to this point nothing has been mentioned that would account for the neglect of this proposed solution, obvious as it seems, by practically all students of the Epistles. The stumbling-block is found in the language used by Plato, Epistle VIII, 357bc, which I will quote: ἔστιν δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀδύνατα · ἃ γὰρ ἐν δυοῖν τε ὄντα ψυχαῖν τυγχάνει καὶ λογισαμένοις εὐρεῖν βέλτιστα ἐτοίμως ἔχει, ταῦτα δὲ σχεδὸν ὁ κρίνων ἀδύνατα οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖ. λέγω δὲ τὰς δύο τὴν τε Ἰππαρίνου τοῦ Διονυσίου υἱέος καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐμοῦ υἱέος · τούτοις γὰρ συνομολογησάντων τοῖς γε ἄλλοις Συρακοσίοις οἶμαι πᾶσιν ὅσοι περ τῆς πόλεως κήδονται συνδοκεῖν. Can Plato possibly mean to mention as one of the two minds that possess his ideals that of an infant in arms? Let us not answer in the negative until we have examined the alternative very carefully. Plato had great faith in heredity and in education. It is at least possible that in the absence of solid grounds he set all his hope on the expectation that Dion's son would follow in his father's steps. It is like Plato to be most emphatic when he is most paradoxical. Fantastic as Plato's proposal becomes if we suppose that it concerns such an infant, surely it is not more fantastic than other proposals in this letter, or in the dialogs of Plato for that matter, when they are examined in the light of actual conditions. This passage is hardly so conclusive as it has been supposed to be.

The possibility that Plato may have the infant in mind here once admitted, let us see whether there are any indications in the language of the passage that will turn the possibility into a probability. Why does Plato employ the expression λογισαμένοις εὐρεῖν βέλτιστα ἐτοίμως ἔχει in coördination with ἐν δυοῖν ὄντα ψυχαῖν τυγχάνει? Is it that he spoke first of his ideals as already in the minds of two persons (among the three recommended for the kingship, it turns out that Plato means), then added what may be taken as a qualification of his too bold assertion, the statement that (at least) the way is open for anyone (hence *a fortiori* for Dion's son), once he has given due thought to the matter, to discover the excellence of these ideals and so to possess them later and join in making them effective? Plato's language is, I believe, influenced by his consciousness that he is speaking of an infant; he reserves something of his meaning and the construction shifts to follow the shifting thought.

In the last sentence that I have quoted there is a similar shift of construction and an indication that the expected concurrence of the two minds lies some way in the future. Plato says: "When these two *have* come to an agreement, I am sure that all the other Syracusans, at any rate all who have their city's welfare at heart, *are* in accord." Richards' proposal to add *ἄν* after *συνδοκεῖν* would to be sure improve the form of the sentence. As it stands, however, its very irregularity well indicates Plato's wish to speak of the future as already present. We have to translate less literally as follows: "The rest of the Syracusans who have the city's welfare at heart are in accord, I am sure; we need only wait for these two to arrive at an agreement." There would be no such occasion for a period of waiting, except for the fact that one of the two had still to develop for many years before becoming capable of appreciating Plato's ideals.

To sum up, we have adequate evidence that Dion's elder son, Hipparinus Aretaeus, is not named in Plato's Epistles and that he is not referred to in the eighth Epistle. This was the opinion of Plutarch, who is in this case a particularly competent authority, and it is the only opinion that squares with the facts. Even the passage most difficult to explain on the assumption that this view is correct, is found on examination to be, if still a stumbling-block, at least not an insuperable one, and to have peculiarities that need the present hypothesis to explain them.

With the removal of this supposed historical discrepancy the way is clear to accepting the evidence of style and thought and considering the eighth Epistle a genuine work of Plato, who here uses a literary form developed by Isocrates and frequently employed by his contemporaries to put a political program before the public. The Letter is already accepted as genuine by such competent authorities as Burnet, Wilamowitz, Ritter and Eduard Meyer, not to mention others, and it is not unworthy to rank as a Platonic contribution to ephemeral literature.

L. A. Post.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

VI.—THE INDEFINITE FIRST SINGULAR.

Frequent association with the subjunctive mood has drawn a great deal of attention to the indefinite second singular; but the corresponding use of the first person has passed almost unnoticed.

Many of the best cases are found in passages where a speaker, needing two indefinites, introduces *ego* as a foil to *tu*. This situation is reflected in the colloquial "*meum* and *tuum*," as when it is said of a person of questionable honesty: "His ideas of *meum* and *tuum* are somewhat confused."

Thus used, the words *meum* and *tuum* do not refer to the speaker and hearer. They are quite indefinite in scope, connoting something like "one's own property" and "the property of others." Cf.:

Cicero, Tusc. Disp. v. 63: In hoc enim genere nescio quo pacto magis quam in aliis suum cuique pulchrum est. Adhuc neminem cognovi poetam, et mihi fuit cum Aquinio amicitia, qui sibi non optimus videretur. Sic se res habet; *te tua, me delectant mea*.

This passage has to do with a poet's predilection for his own compositions. The tenor is general throughout; and, at the end, *te* and *tua* are certainly indefinite, for they could have no application to the hazily conceived young interlocutor.

Though Cicero himself was a writer of verse, it is quite likely that *me* and *mea* are meant to be equally indefinite; in fact, to make the words specific would seem to put the speaker and Aquinius in the same class—a meaning which we may be sure that Cicero did not intend to suggest!

Juvenal, III. 288 ff.:

Miserae cognosce prooemia rixae,
Si rixa est, ubi *tu* pulsas, *ego* vapulo tantum.
Stat contra starique iubet; parere necesse est;
Nam quid *agas*, cum *te* furiosus cogat et idem
Fortior?

This satire represents a friend of Juvenal's as shaking from his feet the dust of Rome. At the gate, he pauses long enough to set forth the miseries of city life that cause him to seek a

quieter abode. Among other things, he mentions the propensity of roistering blades to rove about at night in quest of defenseless victims they may abuse.

In the lines quoted, there is no reference to Juvenal, of course; *tu* is the typical bully, and *ego* is the peaceable pedestrian: "Hear now the start of a wretched brawl—if brawl it is, where one party does the beating, and the other suffers all the blows."

This example is particularly interesting because, just two lines farther on, the case of the victim is shifted to the indefinite second singular (note *agas* and *te*), while further reference to the bully now requires the third person (*furiosus cogat*). Compare also the following:

Juvenal, XVI. 17 ff.:

Iustissima centurionum
Cognitio est igitur de milite; nec *mihi* deerit
Ultio, si iustae defertur causa querellae.
Tota cohors tamen est inimica, omnesque manipuli
Consensu magno efficiunt, curabilis ut sit
Vindicta et gravior quam iniuria. Dignum erit ergo
Declamatoris mulino corde Vagelli,
Cum duo crura *habeas*, offendere tot caligas, tot
Milia clavorum.

There is a reference here to the difficulty that confronts the civilian in the fact that a case against a soldier can be tried only in a military court. In such a court, the civilian may indeed secure a verdict in his favor, but at the risk of incurring further hurt at the hands of the soldier's friends.

At the outset, the civilian is typified by the indefinite first person (*mihi*), with a shift later to the indefinite second (*Cum duo crura habeas*).

The use of indefinite *tu* and *ego* as typifying two opposing parties lends itself readily to lively, dramatic effects; e. g.

Cicero, de Off. ii. 83 ff.; Habitent gratis in alieno. Quid ita? ut, cum *ego* emerim, aedificarim, tuear, impendam, *tu* me invito fruire meo? Quid est aliud aliis sua eripere, aliis dare aliena? Tabulae vero quid habent argumenti, nisi ut *emas mea* pecunia fundum, eum *tu* habeas, *ego* non habeam pecuniam?

Cicero here is discussing the evils of confiscation and cancellation of debts. Midway in the passage, the two factions affected by such measures are referred to by the colorless *aliis* . . .

aliis. The difference in style incident to the employment of indefinite *tu* and *ego* is well illustrated at the beginning and the end of the citation. So again:

Cicero, in Verr. ii. 3. 193: *Tu*, cum tibi *ego* frumentum in meis agris atque in mea civitate, denique in iis locis, in quibus versaris, rem geris, provinciam administras, paratus sim dare, angulum *mihi* aliquem eligas provinciae reconditum ac derelictum? iubeas ibi *me* metiri, quo portare non expediat, ubi emere non possim?

This passage has to do with the abuses incident to the collection of taxes in Sicily during the period of Verres' misrule. The Roman official is represented by *tu*, while *ego* stands for the agricultural interests generally. Though not himself an aggrieved provincial, Cicero naturally uses the first person for the party with which he is in sympathy.

Though some of the best examples of the indefinite first singular are found in passages where there is antithesis to indefinite *tu*, there are good cases also where *ego* lacks such balance, notably in connections where a general principle is laid down and followed by one or more illustrations; e. g.

Cicero, p. Caec. 74: *Mihi* credite, maior hereditas uni cuique nostrum venit in isdem bonis a iure et a legibus quam ab iis, a quibus illa ipsa bona nobis relictasunt. Nam ut perveniat ad *me* fundus, testamento alicuius fieri potest; ut retineam quod *meum* factum sit, sine iure civili fieri non potest.

Seneca, de Ira, iii. 34. 1 ff.: Crede *mihi*, levia sunt propter quae non leviter excandescimus, qualia quae pueros in rixam et iurgium concitant; . . . auferre hic *mihi* hereditatem voluit; hic *me* diu in spem supremam captatis criminatus est; hic scortum *meum* concupivit.

As above noted, interest in the indefinite second singular has hitherto rather overshadowed the corresponding use of the first person. But the latter must be taken into account in any comprehensive treatment of indefinite uses.

H. C. NUTTING.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

REPORTS

HERMES, Vol. LVIII (1923), Nos. 3 and 4.

Die Feldzüge Antiochos' des Groszen nach Kleinasien und Thrakien (241-287). O. Leuze continues his study of the chronology of these campaigns. He devotes considerable space to prove that P. Scipio Africanus was not sent as an ambassador to Antiochus in the year 193 B. C., as Acilius stated (cf. Livy XXXV 14, 5-12), nor in the year 192 B. C. as Nissen conjectured. Neither did he go there on a tour of investigation in 193 as Holleaux tried to show (cf. A. J. P. 38, 213). The story of Scipio's interview with Hannibal dealing with the ranking of generals is one of the numerous legends that were invented to glorify Scipio.

Vergil's Sechste Ekloge (288-304). G. Jachmann shows that Vergil followed a plan in his enumeration of the Silenus songs. The first one tells of origins down to animals roaming on mountains; then continues with the ancestors of the human race, the age of Saturn and concludes with Prometheus who introduced the age of invention. After this follows a catalogue of songs of love and transformation, myths that are at least formally related. The Hylas myth seems to form a transition. The strong contrast presented by the Gallus poem only heightens the honor that Vergil conferred upon his friend. Jachmann develops his idea with interesting discussions of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (I 496 ff.), Verg. Georg. IV 345 ff.; II 475 ff., Ovid *Ars Am.* II 467 etc. The cosmogony of the first song was clearly not derived from Lucretius as shown by vv. 32, 33: *semina terrarumque animaeque marisque . . . et liquidi simul ignis*, the term *semina* notwithstanding. On the other hand Vergil did not derive the idea of four elements from Empedocles or the Stoa, but more probably from a popular conception.

Zur Textkritik der Dionysiaka des Nonnos (305-321). H. Tiedke discusses and emends a number of passages of the *Dionysiaca*, and supports his conjectures largely with the usage of Nonnus.

Metrische Beiträge (322-326). K. Münscher after expressing high praise of Wilamowitz' *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), takes exception to his treatment of the Alcaic verse; viz., whereas Wilamowitz l. c. II ch. 13 believes that Horace's caesura separated original elements of verse: $\times - \cup - - - \cup \cup - \cup \times$, Münscher holds that the Alcaic verse was composed of an iambic member, followed by a Telesilleion ($\times - \cup \cup - \cup \times$). Nor did Horace derive his theory of long syllables and caesuras from a book on

meters. Horace with Roman strictness made a rule of what was only a tendency (cf. A. J. P. XLIV 73).

Synkrisis (327-368). F. Focke gives a detailed account of the comparison of persons and things in Greek and Roman literature in order to show the historical elements and traditional *γένος* in the brief comparisons appended to the *Lives* of Plutarch who, saturated with the ancient culture, produced in these comparisons the fruit of his old age. That he was conscious of the agon motif is shown in Theseus I: τοιῶδε φωτὶ κτλ.; this popular motif was also influential in later European literature. Many examples are extant of its use in ancient times, viz.: certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, δίκαιος καὶ ἄδικος Λόγος in Arist. Clouds, comparisons between philosopher and king (Alexander and Diogenes) etc. Such topics were adopted in the rhetorical schools, and the influence of rhetoric shows itself early. Writers of encomia were fond of finding resemblances, for which mythology and art furnished abundant material. That the encomium must introduce distinguished parallels was recommended by Aristotle (Rhet. I 9, 1368a 19) and Anaximenes (§ 35, p. 83, Sp.-H) and was exemplified by Isocrates in his Euagoras. Focke continues with a discussion of literary criticism, which was dominated by ethical standards, and of historiography, which began with comparative ethnography (cf. Herodotus and Hippocrates π. ἀέρων, ὑδάτων, τόπων). The sources of Plutarch's comparisons have received little attention, whereas a flood of literature has covered the *Lives*. Focke shows that Solon's poems, Timaeus and rhetorical teaching furnished some data that are not found in the *Lives*. That Plutarch practised the art of eulogistic comparison in his youth is shown by his 2. declamation: π. τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχης ἢ ἀρετῆς; and in these comparisons rhetorical doctrine can be shown in detail. As regards their evident ethical purpose, Leo has shown that this feature originated in the Peripatetic school. It became a habit with Plutarch in the course of his ethical studies. The comparison of Roman with Greek characters had become a tradition long before Plutarch's time, for which Panaetius and Polybius had laid the foundation.

Neue Bruchstücke des Römischen Festkalenders (369-392). Georg Wissowa discusses recent notable additions to the *Fasti*, which had received only few additions since Mommsen published his second edition in CIL, I². He takes up in order fragments found at Ostia, Praeneste and Antium. At the last place more than 300 fragments of stucco with letters painted in black and red were found and have been admirably pieced together. These stucco fragments revealed themselves as the remains of a pre-Julian calendar with its 355 days, in many respects a most important discovery. For example it confirms several of Ovid's

dates of temple foundations. The Praeneste calendar fixes Oct. 23 as the date of the second battle at Philippi.

Die Betriebsformen des Griechischen Handels im IV. Jahrh. (393-425). J. Hasebroek gives a detailed picture of Greek commerce during the IV century B. C., based mainly on the orators, as he did of the banking system (cf. A. J. P. XLII 346). There was no business by commission, which did not arise until after the middle ages; no system of transportation between definite ports; no bills of lading. The foreign trade was originally in the hands of ship owners, who carried their own goods to market (*ναύκληροι*); but as they had room, not only for passengers (originally *ἔμποροι*, later *ἐπιβάται*), but also for additional freight, a class of traders arose who paid freight charges and accompanied their goods either in person or by a representative; these were known as *ἔμποροι*. From the frequency of this practice, *ἔμπορος* became a general term to designate the foreign trader, including the *ναύκληρος*, who never became a mere freighter. In juxtaposition the *ναύκληρος* was a trader who owned the vessel, in contrast with the *ἔμπορος* (or at times *ἐπιβάτης*), who paid freight charges. In either case the goods were always accompanied by the owner, or his representative, to foreign ports where they were exhibited and sold in bulk or at retail. The *ναύκληρος*, as owner of the ship, had the advantage of being able to change his destination, if he happened to hear of a better market for his goods, and better prospects for a return cargo, an important consideration in view of the limited circulation of local coinage. The advantage offered by Athens is shown in Xenophon (De Vectig. III 2). The *ἔμπορος* at times was compelled to transfer his goods to another vessel. This foreign trade was largely dependent on capital borrowed on bottomry or the hypothecated cargo, and it is noteworthy that the lender, or his representative, would be among the passengers, unless he had an agent at the port of destination to guard his interests. Witnesses generally took the place of written acknowledgments, which became common later (cf. the ostraca and papyri of Egypt). Documentary evidence was confined to loans on bottomry and hypothecated goods, and on return of the loan the document was destroyed. The article contains numerous other details and instructive illustrations from the orators.

Protogamia, Zum Montanismus und Donatismus in Africa (426-440). E. Bickel interprets an inscription found at Carthage in the year 1900 (CIL VIII Suppl. 4 (1916) 25045), which E. Seckel (Berl. Sitzungsab. 1921 p. 989 ff.) calls "ein kirchenrechtliches Denkmal des Montanismus." After a discussion of the sects of Montanists and Donatists in Africa and especially Tertullian's relation to the former, he shows that the term patriarchae of the inscription is explained by the excessive

adoration of bishops by the Donatists. Likewise the term *protogamia* has reference to the refusal of the Donatists to recognize any sacrament excepting their own, hence while advocating monogamy, they excepted marriages that had preceded adoption into their sect, which provision included the spiritual marriages of nuns, the chief grievance of the Catholics. The language of the inscription also points to the IV century A. D.

Eine Doppelfassung in den Sophistenbiographien des Eunapios (441-447). Kurt Latte cites a passage from Photius which describes a *νέα ἔκδοσις* of Eunapius' histories, which, according to Photius, was less violent in its attacks upon the Christians. Latte agrees with Lundström that this revision had been made by Eunapius himself, which some scholars have doubted. A trace of this *νέα ἔκδοσις* appears in a passage of the *Βίοι Σοφιστῶν* which Latte discusses.

Kallinikos von Petra (448-456). A. Stein examines the data in Suidas s. v. *Καλλίνικος, κακοζηλία, Γενέθλιος* and *Ἰουλιανὸς Δόμνου* and concludes that Callinicus belonged to the second half of the III century A. D. The Lupus to whom he dedicated his *Περὶ κακοζηλίας ῥητορικῆς* was probably Virius Lupus who was consul ordinarius in the year 278 A. D. More interesting is the conjecture that the Cleopatra to whom he dedicated his Alexandrian history was Zenobia of Palmyra, who during her brief rule over Egypt adopted the name Cleopatra.

Miscellen: F. Jacoby (457-458) estimates the length of Anaximenes' history of Alexander and concludes that it contained five books rather than nine as Didymus states (cf. i. Demosth. col. 9, 43 ff.).—E. Orth (459-460) emends Bacchylides XVIII (XVII Bl.) 16 *νέ]ον* to *δόμ]ον*.—J. Wackernagel (460-464), under the title *Onomatologica*, emends Varro l. l. IX 55 *enuus enua*, which had been changed to Ennius Ennia, to Aemilius Aemilia; Cic. Verr. IV 148 *Theoractum* to *Theoplactum* (cf. *θεόπλακτος* in Hesychius); *Latreus* to *Elatreus* in Ovid Met. 12, 458; and finally discusses mistakes in transliterating Iranian names: *Μεγάβυζος* for *Μεγάβυξος*, *Ἰνταφρένης* and *Ἀρταφρένης* for *—φέρνης* (due to folk-etymology), *Ἀγαβάτανα* (Wilamowitz, Aesch. Pers. 961) for *Ἀγβάτανα*. The collateral *Ἐκβάτανα* was due to *ἐκβαίνω*.—J. Mussehl (465) acknowledges the precedence of Crusius (cf. Philolog. LXV (1906) p. 159 f.) in explaining Martial's epig. Alphius—Olphius according to A and Ω.—Corrigenda (465) to article Synkrisis p. 327 ff.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLIX, Nos. 1-4.

Pp. 1-47. D. S. Blondheim, *Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge*. A previous

article by the same author was published in the *Romania* in 1910 under the title *Contribution à la lexicographie française d'après des sources rabbiniques*. Dr. Blondheim's researches have now been extended to include besides French and Spanish dialects also those of the Provençal, Catalan, Portuguese and Italian Jews. The texts utilized as a basis for this new study were for the most part translations of portions of the Bible, and this work on the sources was largely made possible by the assistance of many well-known scholars both in Europe and America, especially those interested in the study of Jewish dialects. The translations, it is contended, are ultimately derived from the Greek Bible, through Vulgar Latin forms related to the *Vetus Latina*. The latter, it is asserted, underwent Jewish influence. The work is arranged alphabetically, and the present instalment comprises the letters A to E.

Pp. 48-62. E. Droz, Notice sur un recueil de louanges. Three copies are known of a small book entitled *Les louenges a nostre seigneur || A nostre dame et aux benoitz sains || et saintes de paradis*. It was printed for Antoine Verard shortly after the year 1500 in all probability. The author of this article refrains from giving a complete description, preferring for his part to call attention to several interesting pieces which it contains and to mention the names of some dozen hitherto unknown authors. Of the latter we may note those of Jehan de Cerisy, Pierre Hesglache, Tibault, Regnault Gorra, Amauri Marie, Anthoine Tiart, Frère Jean Bisquet, Gervais Targer, Nicolas Bassereau, Julian Lelest, Jehan Panier, Nicole Petit and Colas Jougon. The literary notes on this period left by the late M. Emile Picot have furnished some of the material used in this article.

Pp. 63-97. Pio Rajna, Varietà provenzali. I. Per la datazione della *Sancta Fides d'Agen*. II. Bernart de Ventadorn, *Qan l'erba fresca*. III. Il più antico trovatore italiano. The veteran Romance scholar of Italy here identifies one of the characters "Corbarin" mentioned in the first poem with Kerbogha, emir of Mossul, defeated by the Christians in the First Crusade, on June 28, 1098. This supplies a probable date for the composition of the poem in question while the heathenish name was in everybody's mouth. In the second section a refutation of Appel's views as to certain rhyming habits of the troubadours is given, and corruption in the manuscript tradition is alleged to be at the bottom of the whole question. The third section calls attention to the fact that Provençal lyrics were written down by the scribes from memory in many instances no doubt, and not copied from earlier manuscripts solely, as is often assumed by modern scholars. Starting out from this basis the author investigates the claims of the oldest Italian troubadour.

Pp. 98-117. *Mélanges*:—Johan Vising, *Encore une fois Desver, Resver*.—Antoine Thomas, “*La feste de la Moutouse*.”—J. Anglade, *A propos de Peire Vidal*, I-VI.—† Gertrude Schoepperle (Mrs. R. S. Loomis) *Pour le commentaire de Villon; Note sur la Ballade des menus propos*.

Pp. 118-126. *Discussions*:—Lucien Foulet, *L'ordre des mots et l'analyse de la phrase*.

Pp. 127-137. *Comptes rendus*.

Pp. 138-150. *Périodiques*.

Pp. 151-160. *Chronique*.

Pp. 161-185. O. H. Prior, *Remarques sur l'anglo-normand*. The history of the French language in England after the Norman conquest has long occupied the attention of scholars, and varying views have been freely expressed. The writer of the present article feels inclined to assume a stronger influence of the native language on the imported French tongue than has hitherto been conceded. Witness, for instance, the jargon called “law French,” which persisted almost down to our own times. An extensive investigation of the English dialects and their influence on the French brought over from the continent is needed before these linguistic questions can be definitely settled.

Pp. 186-203. Maurice Mann, *La couleur perse en ancien français et chez Dante*. Modern French dictionaries state that this is the name of various shades of blue, but Italian dictionaries give to the corresponding word in their language the meaning “deep red.” “Violet” would be a better translation at the present day to designate the color connoted by the Old French term.

Pp. 204-259. Edmond Faral, *La pastourelle*. I.—*L'élément aristocratique*: 1. *Les théories en cours*. 2. *Examen nouveau des textes*. (1.) *L'action et les situations*. (2.) *Les caractères, les sentiments et les mœurs*. II.—*L'élément savant*: 1. *Les théories en cours*. 2. *Examen nouveau des faits*. *Conclusion*. As the result of his painstaking investigations the author concludes that the “pastourelle” is eminently aristocratic, that under the influence of Virgil it is also learned in the Mediæval sense.

Pp. 260-282. *Mélanges*:—Paul Marchot, *Sur le plus ancien texte rétique*.—Albert Dauzat, **Gaba et ses dérivés*.—L. Clédât, *Les anciennes locutions formées avec “ainsi.”*—H. Chaytor, *Fragment of the Roman de Troie*.—Antoine Thomas, *Les plus anciennes manctions du Roman de Berinus*.—Jessie L. Weston, *Notes on the Grail romances: Caput Johannis = Corpus Christi*.—E.-G. Léonard, *Note sur le ms. B. N. lat. 17730*.

Pp. 283-300. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 301-312. Périodiques.

Pp. 313-320. Chronique.

Pp. 321-342. R. Fawtier et E. C. Fawtier-Jones, Notice du manuscrit French 6 de la John Rylands Library, Manchester. This manuscript formerly belonged to Lord Crawford, and it contains only twelve leaves which are fragments of two or three different codices of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It may possibly be no. 1119 of the Libri collection as described in the catalogue. Our manuscript contains a series of French texts which are preserved in only a few copies, two of them only in this copy. The most important one is *La vie de Saint Alexis* as edited by Gaston Paris, but only a portion of the text is here preserved.

Pp. 343-388. D. S. Blondheim, *Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge* (suite). This second instalment includes the letters F to P.

Pp. 389-416. J. Jud, *Mots d'origine gauloise? Troisième série*. Only six words and groups of words are investigated in this new series, the best known of them being the French words *Auvent* and *Blé*.

Pp. 417-432. *Mélanges*:—Georges Thouvenin, *Le fabliau de "L'oue au chapelein" et une légende orientale*.—L. Clédât, *Livre, issu de Libra, a-t-il les deux genres?* (quoting Laubscher, *The syntactical causes of case reduction in Old French*).—L. Clédât, *L'article défini devant les adjectifs numéraux*.—J. Anglade, *A propos d'une pièce de Peire Vidal*.—Pierre Champion, *Trois ballades inconnues de Meschinot*.

Pp. 433-452. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 453-467. Périodiques.

Pp. 468-480. Chronique.

Pp. 481-525. E. Tappolet, *Les noms gallo-romans du moyen*. This article is divided into three parts as follows: I. *Partie technique*; II. *Partie psychologique*; III. *Partie historique*. Several illustrations of old Gallic hubs and an entire wheel give added interest to a complicated linguistic investigation, which is founded in part on the *Atlas linguistique de la France*. A great variety of dialectal forms are here discussed.

Pp. 526-569. D. S. Blondheim, *Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge*. This third instalment includes the letters P (contd.) to Z, the whole series having been divided into 166 sub-heads.

Pp. 570-591. *Mélanges*:—Amos Parducci, *Johannes de*

Bransilva.—Pierre Champion, A propos de Charles d'Orléans: I. La dame anglaise de Charles d'Orléans; II. Recueils imprimés contenant des poésies de Charles d'Orléans.—Grace Frank, The sources of the oldest known edition of Villon.

Pp. 592-597. Discussions:—E. Hoepffner, Pers en ancien français.

Pp. 598-613. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 614-623. Périodiques.

Pp. 624-632. Chronique.

Pp. 633-640. Table des matières.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

REVIEWS.

T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura recensuit emendavit supplevit
HERMANNUS DIELS. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. xlv, 410 pp. 8vo.

Diels' fame rests securely on his work in Greek philosophy but throughout his long life he was interested in Lucretius, and in his student days at Bonn his first *Seminararbeit* was a paper on that poet. In his last illness during June 1923 he corrected the proof of this book as far as the end of Book iv, and the printing of the remainder was supervised by his pupil Mewaldt. He had planned a commentary on the poem; and it is an irreparable loss to science that through the temporum iniquitate, as he says, the commentary will never appear. But a volume containing a German translation may be soon expected.

The book is a handsome specimen of the printer's art and is equal to the best of the ante bellum productions of the German press. It is rubricated throughout, and dedicated in a rubricated Greek elegiac distich to his friend and associate of fifty-five years—Φιλομωμχίδη, doubtless the great Berlin Hellenist. The preface contains a full description of the manuscripts, of the characteristics severally of the archetype, the ancient testimonia, the orthography of the edition, and its general plan. Then follow six pages of the text of the ancient testimonia, the text of the poem with rubricated headings, rubricated capitula, and rubricated initial letters for the main divisions of the argument. As a further assistance in following the course of the exposition there is wide spacing to distinguish the major parts of the discussion. Testimonia are printed below the text and at the foot of the page the critical apparatus. After the poem, the fragments are given, and at

the end of the book a critical supplement containing all the less important variants of the principal manuscripts.

The edition is the logical successor of Lachmann's famous recension of 1850, and to a great degree will take its place in Germany as the most elaborate edition of the poem. Lachmann lived only one year after the publication of his edition that was the crown of his life work; Diels was less fortunate. Both of the books are the last contributions to learning of scholars of the first rank, and the numerous uncomplimentary references to Lachmann's conjectures, that are printed by Diels in his apparatus, are to be explained by the fact that until Diels, no German edition of Lucretius, worthy of the name, has appeared since Lachmann's time, and Diels would have his work compared directly with that of Lachmann.

The text is founded on the Leyden manuscripts, O and Q, and equal authority to these, so far as they go, is given to the Gottorpian and Vienna fragments. The Laurentian codices Diels regards as ultimately copies of the OQ class and he gives them no independent authority. All of the principal manuscripts go back to a lost codex of the vii century, and that to a lost archetype. Diels identifies the first corrector of O as Otloh of Emeram, who corrected the manuscript at Fulda in the xi century, and who was a critic of the first order. Diels thinks that the Poggian codices were influenced by some manuscripts of the Q class, a position that to the reviewer seems dubious. The original edition of the poem was put together under M. Cicero's authority; Diels thinks by Atticus; and there is no trace in Cicero of any knowledge of Lucretius.

Diels has endeavored to restore the original orthography of Lucretian Latin so far as to introduce a certain 'rusticity'; and here, I think, he has gone too far. He is not unscientific in this matter as were Wakefield and Forbiger; yet if any one of the principal manuscripts and any correction of them points to an ancient form, he seizes on it. Many of the forms will be accepted, such as the nom. pl. in -is already restored by Munro, frudem, quasei, probarei, sei, quatinus, sordeis; but such monstrous shapes as quocturnicibus, quoquere, utrimsequos, after the Lucilian fashion, are very doubtful. While I think that the longer form nihil should be restored, I cannot approve of nihilum beginning a metrical foot, nor of vehementer under similar circumstances. No apocope of s is indicated (e. g. i 591 inmutabilis materiae) which leads to the strange posterioribus signis in v 627. And yet Diels' courage failed him in some matters: he does not accept veluti of the manuscripts before a vowel, and he writes opportuna in spite of oportuna of the codices; ungentum he passes over in vi 974. Adque is a favorite form and ad for at, quead, essed, capud, and even emineadque in iii 284; and reliquid and quod for quot. And yet in

ii 516 he prints *remensumst* where I follow O with *remensust*; and although O has *optulit* in iii 1041, Diels follows Q¹ in writing *obtulit*; in iii 179 *persubtilem* of Q where O has *persuptilem*, and in iv 425 *adsimili* where O¹ has *atsimili*. Diels capitalizes *Leti* in i 1112, ii 960, iii 42, 67, and *Formidinis* at iv 173. *Leti* was so personified by Conington on Georg. iv 481, and Wakefield personified *Formidinis*. In general I feel that Diels would have been wiser if he had followed O alone in his spelling.

The text continues, and in a way concludes, the revolt against Lachmann that has appeared in ever increasing measure in the work of Bernays, Munro, Brieger, Giussani, Bailey, Ernout, and (*salva verecundia*) the reviewer. The net result is an agreement with Wakefield although these modern Lucretians by no means have been following at his heels, as was said once by an arrogant British critic. Wakefield's critical method, so far as he had one, differed *toto caelo* from that of Lachmann and his successors, yet *post hoc propter hoc* does not apply here. I have counted 34 places where the Ms. reading is first recalled by Diels since Wakefield (excepting several instances in the reviewer's text of 1917): for example *summum* i 555 and *extremum* ii 1116, a before s in ii 1135, iv 1122, vi 1047; *remedii* vi 1226, *canceris* v 617, *nymphis* vi 1178. Others have anticipated Diels in recalling the mss.; the writer at ii 112, 850, 1165, v 186, vi 250, 600; Forbiger at ii 805; W. A. Baehrens at iv 324; Bockemueller at vi 483; Ellis at vi 971; the old vulgate at v 182, vi 519, and Shackler at v 182;—all without acknowledgement by Diels, who may be forgiven for overlooking such a trivial matter. But Diels is first to recall *ulla* at i 667, *inane* 1009, *mente* (nom.) ii 18 and iii 240, *tergibus* ii 88, *modoque* ii 92, *igne* (nom.) ii 382, *prorem* ii 554, *adepto* ii 1133, *tumulto* iii 834, *baratre* iii 955, *necessu est* iv 516, *hoc* iv 615, *is* iv 1154, *rapidis* v 892, *stirpes* v 34. Some of these I cannot bring myself to approve: *adepto* in ii 1133, for *adempto*, changes the sense; *tumulto*, Q* at iii 834, is due to *oris* in the next line; *necessu est* at iv 516 points to *necessust*; *hoc* iv 615 as an ablative of comparison is extremely doubtful; *is* iv 1154 I suggested tentatively in 1907; and *rapidis* v 892 of Sylla's dogs is absurd.

Diels prints some 80 conjectures of his own, not all of which he admits into his text. A cynic might say that the larger the number of attempts a critic makes, the more likely he is to hit the mark. The chances are all against the conjectural critic, and scholars have dealt harshly with the work of their predecessors. Thus Diels accepts five only of Lachmann's 50, and the writer thinks himself very fortunate in having nine of his proposals adopted. In gratitude therefore I wish that I could accept as many of his, but not one

of his 80 seems to me absolutely certain; as highly probable I would mention *tonguit* at ii 456, *secum te* at iv 1282 where Bernays has *se tecum*; as ingenious but dubious, *inibi* for *morbi* vi 663, *Tmari* vi 879; the ingenious arrangement of vi 972 with Voss' *fronde hac*; the brilliant *habitam* in the sense of *inhabitatam* in v 201, that is unfortunately unsupported and perhaps unsupportable. Plausible conjectures are *terrast* i 469 (where I should read *terraest*), *ut claustra* iv 81, *vellera* iv 140, *locis* vi 755, *potis his* vi 762. Impossible to my mind are *simili* in ii 381 (previously suggested by Shackle), *utrumque* ii 461, *sorde* ii 84, *subida* iv 1209, *pos sunt* iv 1252, *incolumiei* v 61, *nativoque* v 66, *consumit* v 692, *inactae* v 1339, *intortum* vi 555. Impossible, it seems to me, are *quo de egimus* ii 926, *sic* v 1002, *rabidi* of thunder, v 1193, *inde* v 1190, *maria* vi 632, and *inpediant* vi 1064. As unnecessary changes I consider *variove* ii 825, *suppetiantur* ii 1148, *cupiunt* iv 1118, *e caligine* v 296; and *et lueris* in vi 800 I can not understand. Diels attacked anew the most desperate passages: iii 239 *recipit se posse*, iv 545 *volucres gelidis nocte hortis*, v 312 *si cumque*, vi 550 *res dura ubicumque*; and far from rejecting anything he pieces out fragmentary lines as in iii 475 where he writes *sinapi* for *inani*.

It was easy to overlook the work of others in the Germany of recent years and Diels has several times been anticipated in his conjectures: thus *Musae* in i 657 was advocated by Bignone in 1921, *vist* at iii 492 by Tohte, *videatur* iv 633 by Bergk, *tantast* iv 799 by the reviewer, *ambiens* v 396 by Reid, *rabies* v 1065 by Flor. 31, *refertum* v 1279 by Wakefield, *quidque* vi 29 by the reviewer, *ingratiis* vi 216 by Wakefield, *maeror* is vi 1259 by Forbiger. Many other emendations may or may not be correct, such as *Gai* i 50, *aciem* i 321, *tegmenta* iv 1125 and many more. But a conjecture is worth while if it stimulates activity in others; and even if Diels should be unable to convince his readers, yet his proposals may be the indirect occasion of new, and perhaps successful, attacks on textual difficulties.

Diels is generous in his recognition of the work of other scholars, and occasionally he differs from other post-Lachmannians in accepting old conjectures like *possidantur* of Havercamp at i 390, *quire* at i 748 from F (lately approved by Pascal), *extra* ii 106 of Grasberger, *acris* ii 579 of Purmann, *nequeunt* ii 922 of Gifanius, *stata* v 1164 of Orelli. Of modern work he accepts *ignist* of Bockemueller at i 453, *ecum* vi and *statuas* of Munro at ii 42, 43 and he adopts many emendations long generally received, and others proposed by Reid, Fay, the very attractive conjecture *celata acta* by Orth at v 1160, and some by the reviewer.

The apparatus criticus is very full in giving all of the cor-

rections of the principal mss. and the conjectures of scholars since Lachmann. Little of consequence has escaped him and one can be confident of finding in this edition all significant proposals.

In the punctuation I have noted but two novelties: posset, enim in iii 790 after the analogy of vi 1277, and the uniting of iv 1125 to 1123 with transfer of 1124.

Diels has no sympathy with the shifting of paragraphs adopted by Brieger and Giussani; and he abhors lacunae, for all of which he provides stopgaps that at least make sense, even if their Lucretian quality is at times questionable. He transfers a few lines that have always been transferred and marks off a few places as dittographs.

The capitula were printed by Lachmann at the end of his edition and were omitted by all of his successors up to Bailey; but Diels, as the reviewer in 1917, has incorporated them, rubricated, in his text. I now think that Ernout was wise in printing them at the foot of the page, as, although they are valuable in interpretation, they were not written by the poet and are often inapplicable to the places where they stand.

In spite of these blemishes that I have perhaps detected on its fair surface the edition is the work of a master and one that goes far to sustain the eminence of Germany as the home of great scholars. It is one of the great books of German learning, a credit to the erudite editor, and indispensable to Lucretian scholars and highly useful to all Latinists.

W. A. MERRILL.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Italische Gräberkunde, Part 1, Friedrich von Duhn, in Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1924. 688 pp. 35 plates.

Except for Peet's valuable book on "The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily" there has so far been no general study of the prehistoric tombs of Italy. Particularly for the vast masses of material unearthed from the many Iron Age cemeteries the student has had to search the Italian excavation reports and the scattered studies that have appeared in various journals. It is peculiarly fortunate that the long needed study of the early cemeteries of Italy should have been made by a scholar who is at the same time historian and archæologist, who through fifty years of close association with Italian excavators and their work, as well as with archæological exploration in other lands, has a range of experience and a breadth of outlook that are unparalleled.

The work as planned is to comprise two volumes of which the first, which alone has appeared, deals with the tombs of the native population and the so-called "Italic" (that is Latin and Umbro-Sabellic) invaders. The second volume will discuss the tombs of the foreign stock—the Illyrian-Balkan races in the east, the Etruscans, the Greeks, the Carthaginians, and the Celts.

The first section deals with the primitive inhabitants of Italy before the coming of the so-called Italic races. Von Duhn objects to the familiar terms Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages on the ground that the use of metal is not in general a good criterion in dating graves in Italy. Though the coming of the Italic lake-dwellers is usually identified with the Bronze age, copper and, in rarer cases, bronze (see p. 26) were used at an earlier period in Italy, particularly in Tuscany, where copper and possibly tin were mined in very remote times. Von Duhn has shown that before the coming of the lake-dwellers the whole peninsula and the neighboring islands were fairly evenly populated by several different races, all of whom buried their dead. Two considerable groups among them can be distinguished by their burial rites, the Ligurians and the Siculi of ancient tradition, the former occupying the largest part of the mainland, the latter, a people who came from Africa, holding Sicily and Sardinia and a section of Southern Italy.

The bulk of the volume deals with the two "Italic" stems who invaded Italy from the north, the group that cremated their dead, identical with the Latin races, and the group that buried their dead, who formed the Umbro-Sabellic branch. The former, descendants of the lake-dwellers of Switzerland and North Italy, built on piles upon dry land villages that were closely modelled upon the earlier lake dwellings. Their pile villages, known under the convenient term *terremare*, appear in the Po valley in the second half of the second millennium before Christ, a period when the use of bronze had become general. A later stage of the same people is represented by early Iron Age cemeteries such as the one at Villanova which was the first to be thoroughly excavated and has given its name to the culture which it represents. The "Villanova" people crossed the Apennines and spread through the region later known as Etruria, through western Umbria and a small strip of Latium south of the Tiber. All through this district their cremation burials, the so-called *pozzo* graves, attest the coming of these strangers, at whose arrival the native population either disappeared or settled down to life under forms which the newcomers brought. They were the first founders of cities in Italy, and the settlements which they established became in later times the great city-states of Etruria and Latium. Like the pile-dwellers of the north, they seem to have lived at first a communistic life, the

extraordinary uniformity of their tomb accessories probably representing a similar uniformity in worldly possessions. Such a state continued, von Duhn suggests, until the coming of a ruling class, the Etruscans. The unity of culture between Etruria and part of Latium on which von Duhn insists as a result of the study of the graves is supported by much evidence in cults and name forms in the two regions. In the early Iron Age the Tiber was not a dividing line of importance.

The other group of Italic people who buried their dead—the Umbro-Sabellic branch—came into Italy decidedly later than the Latin group. Since so far no traces of them have come to light north of the Apennines, von Duhn thinks it probable that they proceeded directly from the Alps to the Apennines, spread through Umbria and the Sabine country, and came down into the Latin plain to Gabii, Rome, the Latin coast, and the adjoining Volscian hills. Other groups of the Umbro-Sabellic stock made their way to Samnium, whence, in a series of invasions that extended into the historical period, they descended to the rich Campanian coast. Because of inadequate excavations this branch of the Italic people is far less well known than the other. The rarity of imported objects makes the chronology of their tombs especially hard to determine, and such criteria as are secured seldom allow burials in the region to be dated before the seventh century. In general, however, von Duhn notes, the Umbro-Sabellic tribes are distinguished from the Latin by the much smaller interest shown in the cult of the dead. Von Duhn believes that the Umbro-Sabellic tribes had already acquired the rite of inhumation before they came to Italy. But with the absence of evidence for graves that can be assigned to an early date, is there not a possibility that they may at first have practised cremation, and have changed their custom as a result of contact with the primitive inhabitants of Italy, about whose fate after the invasion of the “Italic” peoples practically nothing is known?

The change from cremation to inhumation, which became general among the Latin branch in South Etruria and Latium in the ninth and eighth centuries B. C., von Duhn explains by contact with two different peoples—the Etruscans in the coast towns of Etruria and the Sabines in the inland towns of South Etruria and Latium. Here, and indeed at every other point where von Duhn touches upon the Etruscans, the difficulties are apparent in the arrangement by which the full discussion of the Etruscans is left to the second volume. He considers the “Sabine” fossa (or burial trench) graves of Latium, Veii, and Falerii, but he does not deal in this volume with the fossa graves of Tarquinii, which, except for the greater frequency of imported objects naturally to be expected on the coast, seem very

similar. It would seem possible that the whole culture represented by the fossa graves was due to a migration of Sabines like that of their Samnite kinsmen who invaded the Campanian coast in the south. In that case the coming of the Etruscans would be associated with the earliest chamber tombs. There is a further difficulty of arrangement in the fact that in regions where the Etruscans settled von Duhn omits all burial graves and discusses the cremation burials even when, as in the case of the Tomba del Duce at Vetulonia, he thinks they belong to Etruscans. Moreover in Sabine territory he discusses all burial graves. Thus the Barberini and Bernardini tombs of Praeneste are fully dealt with, while the contemporary Regolini Galassi tomb in Caere is reserved for the second volume. The institution of private property seems in one passage (p. 349) actually to be attributed to the Etruscans in regions where they lived, but the wealth of the tombs of Praeneste and of Monteleone in Umbria, (where the bronze chariot of the Metropolitan was found) is attributed to native landholders.

In the use of his material von Duhn has steadily the point of view of the historian, and his generalizations are of great interest. Though the details of the traditions, especially for the earliest times, are frequently untrustworthy, the evidence of the tombs tends to confirm the general outlines which ancient tradition gives us for the early history of Italy. "Die Überlieferung ist viel besser als moderne Hyperskepsis hat zulassen wollen," von Duhn says in his introduction. In spite of the extraordinary confirmation of Greek legends which prehistoric archæology has provided in the last half century, scholars have been slow in giving up the theory long current that most early Italic and Roman legends are a fabrication of Greek men of learning, who were trying to provide the Italic peoples with a glorious past. Von Duhn's marshalling of a mass of evidence which has hitherto been unwieldy and hard to collect will prove of great value in demonstrating the underlying truth in Italian legendary material.

Especially for Rome the correspondence between tradition and archæology is striking. The fact that earlier cremation graves are found in the Alban hills than in Rome is in accord with the tradition that Rome was founded after Alba and the similarity of the objects discovered supports the close relation which legend indicates for the two cities. The results of excavations have done nothing to discredit the ancient belief that the Palatine was Rome's first settlement. Its necropolis in the Forum, as yet excavated only in very small portions, von Duhn believes shows earlier forms than the neighboring hills, though he would not exclude the possibility of small contemporary settlements on the hills. The tradition that placed the graves of Romulus, Faustulus, and Hostius Hostilius in the Forum, the

custom of delivering funeral orations there, the ancient cult of Vulcan in the region are all in accord with the use of the Forum as a burial place (pp. 413 ff.). The numerous fossa graves which overlap the period of the pozzi are relics of the Sabines whose representative Numa is said to have forbidden that his body be burned. This suggestion, often made before, will probably meet with more general acceptance as a result of the mass of evidence which von Duhn presents in support of it. Scholars, who have of late years been disposed to accept the tradition that an Etruscan dynasty ruled at Rome, will now be more inclined to believe that there is truth in the legends of the earlier Sabine kings. It is to be regretted that Dall'Osso's interesting discoveries on Monte Mario were made too late to enable von Duhn to give us his interpretation of them.

In spite of its good index the book is not an easy one to use. For a single volume it is heavy and unwieldy. The maps showing where cemeteries have been found and the plates with drawings of burials, cinerary urns, and fibulae are hard to use with the text because of the inconspicuousness of references in the text and the lack of explanatory notes on plates and maps. More adequate illustrations and, wherever possible, photographs instead of drawings were much needed. But such lacks in the book are readily explained by the difficulties that attend the publication of scholarly work in Germany today, and one can rejoice that its publication was not delayed by the impossibility of illustrating it adequately. Von Duhn is altogether justified in the hope that he expresses that his study of the graves will extend the sure historical basis laid by the *Corpus of Latin Inscriptions*. Beside Nissen's invaluable *Italische Landeskunde*, which, as von Duhn notes, failed to make use of the evidence of tombs even to the extent that was possible in its day, the student of early Italian history and geography must now have von Duhn's work at his elbow.

LILY ROSS TAYLOR.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, erklärt von MAX ROTHSTEIN. Erster Teil, Erstes und Zweites Buch, Zweite Auflage. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920. 500 pp.

Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Iterum edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Lipsiae, MCMXXII. Pp. xxiii + 190. 80 cents.

These second editions of two well-known books may be mentioned together. The general character of Dr. ROTHSTEIN'S

copious commentary remains unchanged. It is still "conservative without being dull, fresh and illuminating without being fanciful" (A. J. P. XXI, 462). The first volume has grown from 423 to 500 pages, and now includes much new explanatory and illustrative matter. The discussion as to the definite Greek sources of Roman Elegy has been rewritten—but the matter remains as obscure as ever. *Te*, for *et*, ii, 8, 23, and *nomen*, for *gloria*, i. 7, 9, note, are rather disturbing misprints.

The new Teubner text is an anastatic reprint of the edition of 1911 (A. J. P. XXXIII, 330-336). It corrects a few misprints of the first edition, and makes a number of changes and additions in the apparatus criticus. The editor now agrees with Professor ULLMAN that *F* is derived from *A*, though he still assigns *A* to the 14th century. He makes very few changes in the text, but he now prints *uota*, for *nota*, i, 16, 2; *fata*, for *facta*, iv. 1, 71.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REMIGIO SABBADINI. *Giovanni da Ravenna, Insigne Figura d'Umanista (1343-1408). Da documenti inediti.* Como: Tipografia Editrice Ostinelli, 1924. xii + 258 pp. L. 40.

This first volume of a new series of 'Humanistic Studies' is of special interest, in that it reconstructs the career of a fourteenth-century scholar whose life and works have been almost entirely forgotten. Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna was born in 1343, and died at Venice in 1408. He led a wandering life, as a teacher, at Ravenna, Florence, Venice, Padua, and half-a-dozen other places. Among his pupils were Secco Polenton, Pier Paolo Vergerio, Guarino da Verona and Vittorino da Feltre. As a child, he met Boccaccio, at Ravenna and at Florence, and from 1364 to 1374 he was a friend of Petrarch. In 1400 he was sent from Padua on a mission to Pope Boniface IX, at Rome. Professor SABBADINI's work is documented by copious extracts from unpublished MSS of Giovanni's writings, especially from his autobiography (*Rationarium Vitae*) and his Epistles. And he clinches the distinction between this Giovanni da Ravenna and another who has been much better known (Giovanni Malpaghini, employed as a copyist by Petrarch).

W. P. MUSTARD.

Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History; Res Gestae Divi Augusti*; with an English translation by FREDERICK W. SHIPLEY. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924. xx + 431 pp.

To the professional student of Latin, the most interesting volumes of the Loeb Classical Library are those which are devoted to the less important or less familiar authors. A case in point is Professor SHIPLEY's edition of Velleius Paterculus. This is an excellent piece of work. I hesitate to say "an excellent translation," because a good translation is supposed to reproduce something of the style or tone of the original, and in this case the English is much better, and much more readable, than the Latin. But, after all, Velleius is important as history, not as literature, and no sane person wants a reproduction of his style. The student of history—even the expert Latin scholar—will be grateful for this reliable interpretation of the meaning. As a sort of appendix, the volume includes a good study of the Monumentum Ancyranum.

W. P. MUSTARD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

For some years a group of distinguished Italian scholars have been engaged in preparing a "national edition" of the complete works of Petrarch. It is now pleasant to announce that arrangements for publication have been practically completed, and that the first volume may actually be issued early in 1925. The publisher will be the Casa Editrice Sansoni, of Florence. There will be some 18 or 19 volumes, of about 500 pages each. The price has not been definitely fixed, but it will probably be about 100 lire a volume. The first volume will very appropriately be devoted to the *Africa*, edited by Prof. NICOLA FESTA, of the University of Rome. This is to be followed by several volumes of the Latin letters, prepared by Prof. VITTORIO ROSSI, also of the University of Rome. Other editors engaged are Senator PIO RAJNA, Prof. E. CARRARA, Prof. F. ERMINI, etc. Such names are a sufficient guarantee of the quality of the work, and of its importance to our American libraries.

W. P. MUSTARD.

ERRATUM.

On p. 256, n. 22, line 4, the printer inadvertently substituted *ἔλος* for *ἐλος*.—C. W. E. M.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Selected Bindings from the Gennadius Library. Thirty-Eight Plates in Color. With Introduction and descriptions by Lucy Allen Paton. Made and printed in Great Britain. Published by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1924. 4°.

Bérard (Victor). Introduction à L'Odyssée. Tome 1. L'Épos homérique; Le poème représenté. Paris, Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1924. 460 pp. 12°. 25 francs.

British Academy, Proceedings, Vol. XI, 1923-24. Haldane (Richard Burdon): Bernard Bosanquet, 1824-1923. Mackail (J. W.): Bentley's Milton. Poole (Reginald L.): The Early Correspondence of John of Salisbury. Pringle-Pattison (A. S.): The Philosophy of History. Tout (T. F.): The Beginnings of a Modern Capital (London and Westminster in the Fourteenth Century).

Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Hrg. von den Akademien der Wissenschaften in München und Wien. Reihe A: Regesten. Abt. 1: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, bearbeitet von Franz Dölger. 1. Teil: Regesten von 565-1025. München und Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1924. Pp. xxix + 105. 4°.

Dennis (Holmes Van Mater, 3d). Hippo Regius from the Earliest Times to the Arab Conquest. Princeton University dissertation. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1924. Pp. 74. 8°.

Devoto (Giacomo). Adattamento e distinzione nella fonetica latina. Firenze, Felice Le Monnier. Pp. xii + 132, 8°.

Diehl (Ernestus). Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres. fasc. 2-3. Berlin, Weidmann, 1924. Pp. 81-240, 8°. Each fasc. M. 3.75.

Frank (Tenney). Roman Buildings of the Republic. An Attempt to Date them from their Materials. American Academy in Rome, 1924. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III.) Pp. 149, 8°.

Franklin (Benjamin). The Life of, written by himself. Edited from his Original Manuscript by John Bigelow. London, Humphrey Milford; New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch. (The World's Classics, 250.) Pp. lxx + 247, 16°. \$80.

Giannelli (Giulio). La spedizione di Serse da Terme a Salamina. Milano, Società editrice "Vita e Pensiero." (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Serie quinta, Scienze Storiche, Vol. V.) 80 pp. 8°.

Glover (T. R.) Herodotus. Berkeley, Cal., The University of California Press, 1924. Pp. xv + 301, 8°.

Goldsmith (William M.) Evolution or Christianity; God or Darwin? St. Louis, Mo., and Winfield, Kansas, The Anderson Press, 1924. Pp. 144. 12°. \$.50.

Griswold (H. D.) The Religion of the Rigveda. (The Religious Quest of India Series.) New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. Pp. xxiv + 392, 8°. \$4.20.

Gudeman (Alfred). Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur. Berlin

und Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.*, 1923. 2 vols., 120, 148 pp. 16°. (Sammlung Göschen.)

Hamilton (Alfred Porter). *Compounds of the Word "Cow." A Study in Semantics.* University of Pennsylvania dissertation. Philadelphia, 1923. Pp. 59, 8°.

Harrer (G. A.) *The Site of Cicero's Villa at Arpinum.* (Reprinted from *Studies in Philology*, XXI, 4, October, 1924, pp. 541-570.)

Hazlitt (William). *Lectures on the English Poets.* London, *Humphrey Milford*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch.* (The World's Classics, 255.) Pp. 256, 16°. \$.80.

Hibbard (Laura A.) *Mediaeval Romance in England. A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-cyclic Metrical Romances.* New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. viii + 342, 8°. \$3.50.

Hinnisdaels (Georges). *L'Octavius de Minucius Felix et L'Apologétique de Tertullien.* Bruxelles, *Marcel Hayez*, 1924. Pp. 139, 8°.

Homère, *L'Odyssée.* Tome 1: Chants I-VII. Texte établi et traduit par Victor Bérard. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Twice 199 pp. 12°. 25 frs.

Horace. *Oeuvres d'Horace.* Texte latin avec un commentaire critique et explicatif des introductions et des tables par F. Plessis, P. Lejay et E. Galletier. Odes, Épodes et Chant séculaire, publiés par Frédéric Plessis. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1924. Pp. lxxvii + 396, 8°. 35 francs.

Howe (George) and Harrer (Gustave Adolphus). *Roman Literature in Translation.* New York and London, *Harper & Brothers*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 630, 8°. \$4.00.

Inter-America. English: Volume VIII, No. 1, October 1924. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Company.*

Jaeger (Werner). *Stellung und Aufgaben der Universität in der Gegenwart.* Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. 27, 8°. M. —.80.

Kromayer (Johannes). *Antike Schlachtfelder. Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte.* Viertes Band: Schlachtfelder aus den Perserkriegen; aus der späteren griechischen Geschichte und den Feldzügen Alexanders und aus der römischen Geschichte bis Augustus von J. Kromayer u. G. Veith. 1. Lieferung. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. 170, 8°. M. 7.50.

Lehman (Linwood). *Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress, especially in Plautus and Terence.* University of Virginia, 1924. 81 pp., 8°.

Mahā Bhāratha (The) in English. Part I (containing the first ten Parvas). By K. S. Seshagiri Iyer. Mylapore, 1924. Pp. 95, 16°. 10 Annas.

Manning (Clarence A.) *Language and International Affairs.* (Reprinted from the July number of *The Sewanee Review*, 1924, pp. 1-19.)

Newhall (Jane Peers). *The Lyric Portions of Two Dramas of Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis, Iphigenia among the Taurians. Set to Music.* (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 5, June, 1924.) Pp. 49.

Shakespeare, *Othello, the Moor of Venice.* Edited by C. H. Herford; American edition revised by Raymond M. Alden. New York, London., D. C. Heath and Company, 1924. (The Arden Shakespeare.) Pp. xlii + 176, 16°.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). *A New English Dictionary*, edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, etc. Vol. X. Ti-Z. UNFORESEEING-UN-

RIGHT. By W. A. Craigie. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, June 1924. \$3.50.

Ovid. P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus. Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, by S. G. Owen. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. x + 296. \$7.00.

Patrick (George Z.) Étude morphologique et syntaxique des verbes dans Maistre Pierre Pathelin. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 287-379, June 30, 1924.)

Personalist (The). Vol. V, No. 4. October 1924. Los Angeles, *University of Southern California*. Yearly subscription, \$2.00.

Philological Quarterly, Vol. III, October 1924, No. 4. Published at the *University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa.

Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates, and Crito. Edited with Notes by John Burnet. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. vii + Greek text + 220 pp., notes, 12°. \$2.85.

Rand (Edward Kennard). The Quentin's Memoir on the Text of the Vulgate. Reprinted from The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XVII, No. 3, July, 1924, pp. 197-264.

Reitzenstein (Erich). Theophrast bei Epikur und Lucrez. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1924. (Orient und Antike, 2.) Pp. 108, 8°.

Rostrup (Egill). Attic Tragedy in the Light of Theatrical History. Translated by Ingeborg Andersen. Kristiania, London, Berlin, *Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag*, 1923. Pp. 166, 8°.

Rudberg (Gunnar). Kring Platons Phaidros. Göteborg, *Eranos' Förlag*, 1924. (Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistiska Avhandlingar, 1.) Pp. 166, 8°. 6 Kronor.

Smyth (Herbert Weir). Aeschylean Tragedy. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1924. Pp. vii + 234, 8°. Cloth, \$3.50, postpaid.

Tegnér (E.) Fritiof's Sage. Translated in the Original Metres by C. D. Locock. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. Pp. 140, 12°.

Titchener (John Bradford). The Manuscript-Tradition of Plutarch's *Aetia Graeca* and *Aetia Romana*. Urbana, *The University of Illinois*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. IX, No. 2, May 1924.) 68 pp. 8°.

University of Wales. Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. II, Part II. May, 1924. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price \$2.50.

Velde (Rein van der). Thessalische dialektgeographie. Doctoral Diss. Nijmegen, Utrecht, N. V. *Dekker & Van de Vegt en J. W. Van Leeuwen*, 1924. Pp. xii + 182, 8°.

Vollgraff (C. W.) ΕΠΙΦΩΣ ΕΣ ΓΑΛ' ΕΠΙΕΤΟΝ (Over den oorsprong der dionysische mysteriën). (= Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Deel 57, Serie A, No. 2.) Amsterdam, 1924. Pp. 35, 8°.

Walker (J.) The Rhyming Dictionary of the English Language in which the whole language is arranged according to its terminations. Revised and enlarged by Lawrence H. Dawson. London, *George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.*; New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.* Pp. vii + 549, small 8°.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich v.) Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos. 2 Bände. Pp. viii + 244 + 338. M. 18.

INDEX TO VOLUME XLV.

- Aeneas' City at the Mouth of the Tiber, 64-67
- Aeneid, On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of, 260-275
- I, 599, *Exhaustis* or *Exhaustos*, 179-181
- IV, 551: More Ferae, 176-178
- Aeschylus, Agamemnon, A Suggested Emendation for Line 1459, 72
- Agamemnon, The Metrical Arrangement of the Κομὸς in the, 70-71
- ANDERSON, FLORENCE M. B. A Suggested Emendation for Aeschylus, Agamemnon, Line 1459, 72
- The Metrical Arrangement of the Κομὸς in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus, 70-71
- Archæological Studies, Philological and, 238-259
- Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, An, Cooper's (rev.), 293-296
- Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' Notes on, 351-361
- Armenian Version of Plato's Laws and Minos, 105-140
- Athenian Generals of the Year 424-423 B. C., 141-160
- Bantu Notes, 76-77
- BENDER, HAROLD H. Review of Būga's Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, 198-199
- Books Received, 101-104; 199-204; 300; 398-400
- Caesura, The Doctrine of, A Philological Ghost, 329-350
- CLARK, CHARLES U. Review of Lowe and Rand's Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger, 88-90
- COFFMAN, GEORGE R. Correspondence, 96
- Comedy, An Aristotelian Theory of (rev.), 293-296
- CONYBEARE, FRED C. On the Armenian Version of Plato's Laws and Minos, 105-140
- Correspondence, 94-96; 96; 397
- DEWITT, NORMAN W. Aeneid IV, 551: More Ferae, 176-178
- DeWitt's Virgil's Biographia Litteraria (rev.), 91-92
- Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost, 329-350
- Early Latin Verse, Lindsay's (rev.), 296-299
- EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 78-82; 284-288; 380-383
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. The Meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, 1-46
- Erratum, 397
- Exhaustis* or *Exhaustos*, Aeneid I, 599, 179-181
- FRANK, TENNEY. Aeneas' City at the Mouth of the Tiber, 64-67
- Latin Quantitative Speech as Affected by Immigration, 161-175
- The Letters on the Blocks of the Servian Wall, 68-69
- Review of Dessau's Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, 192-194
- Janell's P. Vergili Maronis Opera, 90-91
- Galen's De sanitate tuenda, etc. (rev.), 194-195
- Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, Dessau's (rev.), 192-194
- Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau, Memorial Notice of, 97-100
- Giovanni da Ravenna, Sabbadini's (rev.), 396
- HAUPT, PAUL. Philological Studies, 47-63
- Philological and Archæological Studies, 238-259
- HEIDEL, W. H. Vergil's Messianic Expectations, 205-237
- Review of Galen's De sanitate tuenda, etc., 194-195

- Hellenen und Barbaren, Juethner's (rev.), 189-192
Hermes, Report of, 78-82; 284-288; 380-383
HIRST, GERTRUDE. Notes on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X, 276-283
History of Magic and Experimental Science, Thorndyke's (rev.), 93
HYDE, WALTER W. Review of Juethner's Hellenen und Barbaren, 189-192
Hyde's Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art (rev.), 85-88
Indefinite First Singular, The, 377-379
Index, 401-404
Italische Gräberkunde, Duhn's (rev.), 391-395
Janell's P. Vergili Maronis Opera (rev.), 90-91
JOHNSON, HELEN. Notes on the Rāuhineyacaritra, 73-75
Juvenal, I, III, VI, X, Notes on, 276-283
KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of Romania, 83-85; 383-387
KIRK, W. H. Aeneid I, 599, *Exhaustis* or *Exhaustos*, 179-181
LAING, GORDON J. Review of Adams' A Study in the Commerce of Latium, 291-292
Latin Quantitative Speech as Affected by Immigration, 161-175
L'Etna Poème, Vessereau's (rev.), 93-94
Letters on the Blocks of the Servian Wall, 68-69
Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, Būga's (rev.), 198-199
Lucan's Pharsalia, 301-328
Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, Diels's (rev.), 387-391
MALONE, KEMP. Ptolemy's Skandia, 362-370
Map's De Nugis Curialium, Tupper and Ogle's (rev.), 195-196
MERRILL, W. A. Review of Diels's Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, 387-391
Messianic Expectations, Vergil's, 205-237
Metrical Arrangement of the *Koumós* in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, 70-71
MILLER, C. W. E. Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, 97-100
MUSTARD, WILFRED P. Correspondence, 397
Report of Rivista di Filologia, 182-184; 288-290
Reviews:
Bourgery's Sènèque, Dialogues, Tome II, 196-197
DeWitt's Virgil's Biographia Litteraria, 91-92
Hosius' Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV, 396
Johnson's Francisci Petrarchae Epistolae Selectae, 197-198
Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, 395-396
Sabbadini's Giovanni da Ravenna, 396
Shipley's Velleius Paterculus, 397
Thorndyke's History of Magic and Experimental Science, 93
Tupper and Ogle's Map's De Nugis Curialium, 195-196
Vessereau's L'Etna Poème, 93-94
Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' 351-361
on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-423 B. C., 141-160
on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X, 276-283
on the Rāuhineyacaritra, 73-75
NUTTING, H. C. The Indefinite First Singular, 377-379
OGLE, M. B. On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the Aeneid, 260-275
Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art, Hyde's (rev.), 85-88

- PEPPLER, CHARLES W.** Review of Cooper's *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*, 293-296
Petrarch, Italian 'national edition' of, 397
Petrarchae (Francisci) Epistolae Selectae, Johnson's (rev.), 197-198
Philological Studies, 47-63
and Archæological Studies, 238-259
Platonic Epistles, A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in, 371-376
Plato's Laws and Minos, On the Armenian Version of, 105-140
POST, L. A. A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles, 371-376
Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV, Hosius' (rev.), 396
Propertius, Rothstein's (rev.), 395-396
Ptolemy's Skandia, 362-370
Rāuhineyacaritra, Notes on the, 73-75
Reports:
 Hermes, 78-82; 284-288; 380-383
 Revue de Philologie, 184-188
 Rivista di Filologia, 182-184; 288-290
 Romania, 83-85; 383-387
Reviews:
 Adams, A Study in the Commerce of Latium, 291-292
 Bourgery's and Waltz's Sénèque, Dialogues, 196-197
 Būga's Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, 198-199
 Cooper's An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, 293-296
 Dessau's Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, 192-194
 DeWitt's Virgil's Biographia Litteraria, 91-92
 Diels's Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, 387-391
 Hartlich's, Helmreich's, Kalbfleisch's, Koch's Galeni De Sanitate, etc., 194-195
 Hosius' Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV, 396
 Hyde's Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art, 85-88
 Janell's P. Vergili Maronis Opera, 90-91
 Johnson's Francisci Petrarchoe Epistolae Selectae, 197-198
 Juethner's Hellenen und Barbaren, 189-192
 Lindsay's Early Latin Verse, 296-299
 Lowe and Rand's Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger, 88-90
 Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, 395-396
 Sabbadini's Giovanni da Ravenna, 396
 Shipley's Velleius Paterculus, 397
 Thorndyke's History of Magic and Experimental Science, 93
 Tupper and Ogle's Map's De Nugis Curialium, 195-196
 Vessereau's L'Etna Poème, 93-94
 Von Duhn's Italische Gräberkunde, 391-395
 Revue de Philologie, 184-188
 Rivista di Filologia, 182-184; 288-290
ROBERTS, W. RHYS. Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' 351-361
Romania, Report of, 83-85; 383-387
Sāṅkhya and Yoga, The Meaning of, 1-46
Sénèque, Dialogues, Bourgery's and Waltz's (rev.), 196-197
Servian Wall, Letters on the Blocks of the, 68-69
SHEAR, T. LESLIE. Review of Hyde's Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art, 85-88
Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger, Lowe and Rand's (rev.), 88-90
Skandia, Ptolemy's, 362-370
Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the Aeneid, On, 260-275

- | | |
|--|--|
| STEELE, R. B. Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i> , 301-328 | Velleius Paterculus, Shipley's (rev.), 397 |
| Study in the Commerce of Latium, Adams' (rev.), 291-292 | Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i> I, 599, 179-181 |
| STURTEVANT, EDGAR H. The Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost, 329-350 | <i>Aeneid</i> IV, 551, 176-178 |
| Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles, 371-376 | Vergili Maronis Opera, Jannell's (rev.), 90-91 |
| TAYLOR, GILBERT H. Review of Lindsay's Early Latin Verse, 296-299 | Vergil's <i>Aeneid</i> , Composition of, 260-275 |
| TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. Review of von Duhn's <i>Italische Gräberkunde</i> , 391-395 | <i>Biographia Litteraria</i> , De Witt's (rev.), 91-92 |
| Thorndyke's <i>History of Magic and Experimental Science</i> (rev.), 93 | Messianic Expectations, 205-237 |
| Tiber, Aeneas' City at the Mouth of, 64-67 | WEST, ALLEN B. Notes on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3 B. C., 141-160 |
| TUTTLE, EDWIN H. Bantu Notes, 76-77 | WHEELER, A. L. Correspondence, 94-96 |
| | WIGHT, CAROL V. B. Report of <i>Revue de Philologie</i> , 184-188 |
| | Yoga, The Meaning of <i>Sāṅkhya</i> and, 1-46 |

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE

THIS VOLUME DOES NOT
CIRCULATE

